DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 227 123 TM 830 085

AUTHOR	Hallawell, Ann L.
TITLE	Instrument Catalog.
INSTITUTION	Western Michigan Univ., Kalamazoo. Evaluation Center.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Special Education (ED), Washington, D.C. Div. of Personnel Preparation.
PUB DATE	80
NOTE	165p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Evaluation Center, Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, MI 49008 ($5.00)
PUB TYPE	Reference Materials - Directories/Catalogs (132)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC07 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Adults; *Evaluation Methods; Faculty Development; Higher Education; Inservice Teacher Education; *Measures (Individuals); Observation; Preservice Teacher Education; *Program Evaluation; Questionnaires; Special Education; *Teacher Evaluation; Teachers; Test Format

ABSTRACT

The Evaluation Training Consortium provides evaluation training and instructional materials, and disseminates evaluation resources to preservice and inservice programs in special and regular education. This publication is a reference to evaluation instruments currently in use by personnel preparation programs. The instruments are described and cross-referenced by the kinds of evaluative purposes they address. The listing of instruments presents seven types of information: (1) instrument number, name, and origin; (2) instrument description; (3) respondent(s); (4) item format; (5) program type; (6) number of pages; and (7) the cost. The catalog has been designed for quick reference as a resource for programs wishing to develop or revise their own instruments. Appendix A contains the "Instrument Summary Critique," which includes a total of 22 criteria for assessing the quality of an instrument. (PN)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED227123

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R. Brinkerhoff

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

INSTRUMENT CATALOG

The Evaluation Training Consortium
The Evaluation Center
Western Michigan University

1980

Ann L. Hallawell

TM 830 085

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The following persons contributed various efforts to the development of the Instrument Catalog through instrument critiques, computer programming and review of drafts.

Bob Brinkerhoff
Diana Castell
Roger Hartz
Rob High
Chuck Hunter
Stephen Ledoux
Muriel Katzenmeyer
Nancy Masterson
Chuck Plummer
Laurie Rudolph
Eileen Stryker
Denise Tyiska

A special thank you to those who devoted much time and effort to the completion of this project.

Diane Gillo
Terry Hluchyj
Doug Riley

The production and design of the Instrument Catalog respectively were provided by:

Becky Fitch
Pamela Sargent
Elizabeth Westley

The Instrument Catalog is published under the auspices of the Evaluation Training Consortium (ETC), a project funded by the Division of Personnel Preparation of the Office of Special Education. The goal of the project is to upgrade the program evaluation capabilities of special education-related personnel preparation programs through the development and dissemination of instructional and resource materials in evaluation. The Catalog is free of charge. Copies may be obtained by writing to the Evaluation Center, Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, MI 49008. Point of view or opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect those held by the Office of Special Education or the Department of Education.

PREFACE

In addition to providing evaluation training and instructional materials, the Evaluation Training Consortium (ETC) disseminates evaluation resources to preservice and inservice personnel preparation programs in special and regular education supported (or seeking support) through the Division of Personnel Preparation (DPP) of the Office of Special Education (OSE). This Instrument Catalog is one of those resources. It is the result of a cooperative effort between the ETC project and more than 120 personnel preparation programs throughout the United States. This is a revision and expansion of an earlier catalog compiled by the ETC project (*ETC Instrument Catalogue*, University of Virginia, 1977). The ETC project believes that the sharing of evaluation instruments by personnel preparation programs will have a positive effect on evaluation in the field.

This Catalog is a reference to evaluation instruments currently in use by personnel preparation programs. The instruments are described and cross-referenced by the kinds of evaluative purposes they address. The intent is that they be used as a resource for programs who wish to develop or revise their own instruments.

THE ETC INSTRUMENT CATALOG

This introduction is presented in three sections: (1) Overview; (2) Organization of the Catalog; and (3) Directions for Use of the Catalog.

The "Overview" describes the purposes of the Catalog and how it was developed. The "Organization" section describes the structure of the Catalog, its indexing system and defines terms used in the Catalog. The "Directions for Use" section helps the user locate information and move from one part of the Catalog to another.

OVERVIEW

In July, 1979, copies of program evaluation instruments being used in the field were solicited from all personnel preparation programs on the ETC mailing list. The purpose of the solicitation was to update and expand the previous ETC Instrument Catalog and file. The overwhelming response from the field resulted in this revised Instrument Catalog which contains descriptions of more than five times as many instruments as the eariler version.

The term "instrument" is being used broadly here. The reader, for the purposes of this Catalog, should not expect an "instrument" to refer only to tools of measurement (e.g., a multiple choice test), but to any document used to gather and record information that is useful for program evaluation.

Each new instrument received was briefly critiqued by an ETC staff member. These critiques were standardized using a form listing what we believe to be technical criteria necessary for good instrumentation (See Appendix A), and an inter-rater reliability check was done to assure consistency. No attempt was made to judge the appropriateness of the instrument content (i.e., whether the right kinds of questions were asked or whether the important variables were addressed). This can only be determined by examining the uses of the collected information within a program. Those summary critiques (which have been sent to the contributors) include suggestions for improving the directions, items and formats, etc. A copy of the completed critique accompanies each instrument ordered from our file, so that users will have our suggestions when they revise and improve instruments they receive.

Each instrument was then cataloged according to its intended purpose, resondent(s), length, program type (e.g., inservice, preservice), kind of instrument, (e.g., questionnaire, observation form),

item type(s), and special education content area, (e.g., LD, MR, etc.). This information was used to develop a cross-indexing system grouping instruments having shared characteristics.

IMPORTANT NOTE: The Instrument Catalog is intended to serve as a resource for instrument development. Very few instruments in this Catalog are accompanied by validity/reliability data, which is not surprising, since contributors are most often service programs, not research efforts. The instruments are placed in our file "as is." No attempt has been made to incorporate the suggestions from the critique. Also, because programs differ in their content, purpose and evaluation needs, consumers should not consider this Catalog as a source of off-the-shelf, ready-to-use evaluation instruments. Catalog users are encouraged to order several instruments which address their area of interest, then use the instruments (and their accompanying critiques) as resources to develop instruments custom-tailored to their own program.

ORGANIZATION OF THE CATALOG

This Catalog contains two main sections: a listing of each instrument with descriptive information, and the indices where the instruments are categorized and cross-matched by a number of characteristics.

The Listing of Instruments presents seven types of information:

1. The identification *number*, instrument title and name of the program/project that contributed the instrument.
2. A *description* of the instrument including the instrument type (e.g., questionnaire, objective test) and the *variables* that the instrument attempts to address.
3. The *respondent*, identification of the person(s) who complete(s) the instrument (from whom is the information sought?)
4. The *item types* (e.g., fill-in-the-blank, rating scale).
5. *Program type(s)* in which the instrument may be used (e.g., preservice, inservice).
6. The *length* of the instrument.
7. The *cost* of ordering each instrument.

The price of each instrument is based on a flat rate of 20 cents to cover the cost of the summary critique plus 5 cents per page for the instrument itself. There is a $1.50 charge for the mailing and handling of each order. Orders are limited to eight (8) instruments each. There is no charge for the Catalog.

The Glossary of key terms which often appear in special education preservice and inservice personnel preparation program evaluation instruments are defined here to acquaint the user with the terminology as it has been used in this Catalog.

Direct Service Program – A program that delivers services directly to a client (e.g., a clinic).

Evaluation System – A set of instruments with accompanying information for aggregating and reporting the results.

General Special Education – Special education programs that address special education generically rather than having a specific focus like communicative disorders.

Inservice – Training other than that which leads to a degree; programs, workshops offered to provide further education, experiences for persons already on the job.

Outcomes – The results, impact of a program, course, or workshop.

Practicum – Any learning situation provided and supervised by an institute of higher education where the student receives "on-the-job" training (e.g., student teaching, clinical lab experiences).

Processes – The activities which are intended to occur during a program, course, or workshop.

Preconditions/Resources – Materials, both human and tangible, that are needed before the intended program activities are able to occur.

Preservice – Training which leads to a degree (e.g., college, university, vocational training school).

Respondent – The person(s) identified who should complete the form, answer the questionnaire, etc. In cases when the respondent is not known, the notation is "not specified."

The "Index" section of the Catalog is to help you select instruments, and is organized by the evaluation concern(s) the instruments address. In the "Index" section you will find listings (by identification number) of all instruments in the file designed to address each evaluation concern area we've included. The List of Evaluation Concerns is listed in the "Index" section.

DIRECTIONS FOR USE

This Catalog has been designed for quick reference, but you should carefully read these instructions. The first step in using it is to identify the evaluation concern or question area in your program for which you intend to develop instrumentation, or in which you are interested. Then, to locate instruments which address that concern:

First: Search the *List of Evaluation Concerns* (located in the beginning of the "Index" section) for the area you've chosen to focus on in your program.

Next: Turn to the appropriate index. Each index is subdivided by two or more variables. By selecting the variables that are of particular interest to your program you narrow the focus of the concern. Here is where you'll find the instrument identification numbers.

Then: Jot down the number(s) of the instrument(s) that relate to your interest. To learn more about each instrument (type, length, etc.) refer to the first section of the Catalog where the instruments are described. On the basis of those descriptions select the instruments you'd like to purchase and enter the necessary informaton on the order form (located in the back of the Catalog). Remember, orders are limited to eight instruments.

If you can't find a listing or index regarding a specific characteristic you want to address:

It's possible that there are no instruments of the specific nature that you're in need of. On the other hand, there may be one or two entries that address just what you're looking for. All of our cataloging information has been stored on the computer at W.M.U. for just that reason. By handling special requests, we are able, for example to tell you if there are any instruments in our files that are questionnaires regarding the effectiveness of an inservice workshop for teachers of hearing impaired, (number 275 addresses that topic). Or you may want to know if there are any "graduate follow-up surveys aimed specifically at doctoral students who focused their work in the development of training programs for teachers of physically handicapped children." These are the kinds of questions we'll be able to answer for you by *Special Request*. To make a Special Request complete the "Special Request" order form located in the back of the Catalog.

We hope this Catalog is of use to you. Comments regarding the utility of the Instrument Catalog are welcome and may be addressed to:

Ann Hallawell
Evaluation Center
Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, MI 49008

LIST OF EVALUATION CONCERNS

FOR THESE EVALUATION CONCERN AREAS ..... SEE INDEX NO.

I. Assessing Characteristics of a PROGRAM

- Preservice Practicum 1
- Preservice Course, Program or Project 2
- Inservice Program 3
- Preschool Program 4
- Parent Training Program 4
- Human Service Agency Program 4

II. Assessing Characteristics of a PERSON

- Instructor (Course, Practicum, Workshop) 5
- Students in a Preservice Practicum 6
- Students in a Preservice Course or Program 7
- Graduates On The Job 8
- Inservice Participants 9

III. Special Research Index* 10

*This Special Research Index is designed for researchers who are interested in studying program evaluation relative to a specific area of Special Education and is subdivided by that variable alone.

INDEX NO. 1
ASSESSING CHARACTERISTICS OF A PRESERVICE PRACTICUM

CELL ENTRIES REFER TO INSTRUMENT IDENTIFICATION NUMBERS AS LISTED IN THE FIRST SECTION OF THE CATALOG

WHO COMPLETES THE INSTRUMENT?	WHAT CHARACTERISTIC(S) DOES THE INSTRUMENT INTEND TO INVESTIGATE?				
RESPONDENT(S)	RESOURCES (how used, when, what, etc.)	PROCESSES (what happens, how, when, how well, etc.)	OUTCOMES (what products impacts, etc.)	NEEDS (materials, staffing, resources, etc.)	GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS (more than one characteristic is addressed)
Site Supervisor	18* 30 66	222		375*	211
Supervising Teacher			105	75*	104* 269
Student	213* 339	169 336 289* 346 332*	289* 370		9 212 17* 269 65 293 160 371
Other Than Those Listed Above (see each instrument description for respondent)	162				40 73 156 159

*Contains some items particularly related to Special Education.

For Assessing Characteristics of PERSONS (e.g., students, faculty) involved in a Preservice Practicum see indices 5 & 6.

INDEX NO. 2
ASSESSING CHARACTERISTICS OF A PRESERVICE COURSE, PROGRAM OR PROJECT

CELL ENTRIES REFER TO INSTRUMENT IDENTIFICATION NUMBERS AS LISTED IN THE FIRST SECTION OF THE CATALOG

WHO COMPLETES THE INSTRUMENT?	WHAT CHARACTERISTIC(S) DOES THE INSTRUMENT ATTEMPT TO INVESTIGATE?			
RESPONDENT(S)	PROCESSES (what happens, how, when, how well, etc.)	OUTCOMES (what products, impacts, etc.)	GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS (more than one characteristic is addressed)	OTHER CHARACTERISTICS THAN THOSE LISTED (see each instrument description for characteristic)
Graduated Student	323*	16 123* 107* 323* 110* 381*	67 175* 373*	22*
Current Student	11 206* 174* 328 181 364	4* 121* 33* 251 57 345*	6 268* 112* 340* 180 358	210 235*
Other Than Those Listed Above (see each instrument description for respondent)	114 225 171* 249 203	262	113 131 261 368	

*Contains some items particularly related to Special Education

For assessing characteristics of PERSONS (e.g., students, faculty) involved in a preservice course, program or project see Indices 5 & 7.

INDEX NO. 3
ASSESSING CHARACTERISTICS OF INSERVICE TRAINING

CELL ENTRIES REFER TO INSTRUMENT IDENTIFICATION NUMBERS AS LISTED IN THE FIRST SECTION OF THE CATALOG

WHO COMPLETES THE INSTRUMENT?	WHAT CHARACTERISTIC(S) DOES THE INSTRUMENT ATTEMPT TO INVESTIGATE?					
RESPONDENT(S)	RESOURCES (how used, when, what etc.)	PROCESSES (what happens, how, when, how well, etc.)	OUTCOMES (what products, impacts, etc.)	NEEDS (materials, staffing resources, etc.)	GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS (more than one characteristic is addressed)	OTHER CHARACTERISTICS THAN THOSE LISTED (see instrument description for characteristic)
Inservice Participant		137 318 148* 327 314 341	341 382	303* 313* 379	78 153* 295 99 218* 296* 109 264 349 144 272* 350 149* 275*	382
Other Than Those Listed Above (see each instrument description for respondent)	250 265	331 352*	98	301* 302* 337	97 274* 190 385* 199 386 273*	100

*Contains some items particularly related to Special Education

For Assessing Characteristics of INSERVICE TRAINING PARTICIPANTS see Index 9.

INDEX NO. 4
ASSESSING CHARACTERISTICS OF PRESCHOOL/PARENT TRAINING HUMAN SERVICE AGENCY PROGRAMS

CELL ENTRIES REFER TO INSTRUMENT IDENTIFICATION NUMBERS AS LISTED IN THE FIRST SECTION OF THE CATALOG

WHO COMPLETES THE INSTRUMENT?	WHAT PROGRAM TYPE IS ADDRESSED?		
RESPONDENT(S)	PRESCHOOL PROGRAMS	PARENT TRAINING PROGRAMS	HUMAN SERVICE AGENCY PROGRAMS
Parent	298	183 379	3 176
Teacher	150 307 246 308 298		
Recipient of Services			36 145 146
Other Than Those Listed Above (see instrument description for respondent)	177 300 277 309 297 329 299 378		

INDEX NO. 5
ASSESSING CHARACTERISTICS OF AN INSTRUCTOR IN A COURSE, PRACTICUM, OR WORKSHOP

CELL ENTRIES REFER TO INSTRUMENT IDENTIFICATION NUMBERS AS LISTED IN THE FIRST SECTION OF THE CATALOG

WHO COMPLETES THE INSTRUMENT?	WHAT CHARACTERISTIC(S) DOES THE INSTRUMENT ATTEMPT TO INVESTIGATE?		
RESPONDENT(S)	SKILL/COMPETENCY (specific abilities related to program content)	ATTITUDES/PERCEPTIONS (feelings, opinions, etc., related to a program)	GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS (more than one characteristic is addressed)
Student	208* 226	43 165* 328	7 38 96 256* 9 44 138 293 23 79 212 339 32 95 254* 364 33*
Self (instructor of a course, practicum or workshop)	166		224
Other Than Those Listed Above (see instrument description for respondent)	320* 342 360*	225	168 292 338* 363*

*Contains some items particularly related to Special Education

For Assessing Characteristics of a PRESERVICE COURSE, PRACTICUM, OR WORKSHOP see Indices 1, 2 & 3

INDEX NO. 6
ASSESSING CHARACTERISTICS OF STUDENTS IN A PRACTICUM

CELL ENTRIES REFER TO INSTRUMENT IDENTIFICATION NUMBERS AS LISTED IN THE FIRST SECTION OF THE CATALOG

WHO COMPLETES THE INSTRUMENT?	WHAT CHARACTERISTIC(S) DOES THE INSTRUMENT ATTEMPT TO INVESTIGATE?			
RESPONDENT(S)	SKILL/COMPETENCY (specific abilities related to program content)	HOW TIME IS SPENT (log of activities)	GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS (more than one characteristic is addressed)	OTHER CHARACTERISTICS THAN THOSE LISTED (see instrument description for characteristic)
Site Supervisor	8 259* 102* 260* 157* 290* 252*		5* 53 124* 14* 54 130 37* 66 164* 52* 103 221	
Supervising Teacher	77 88 319 84* 89 347 85 90 348* 86 91 353* 87* 129 354*		12 88 133* 255* 367* 13 104* 161 288* 389* 31 120* 167 326 39 130 211 335 42 223* 366	105
Self (student in the practicum)	377	24 332* 34* 369 76	82 161 119* 253* 122*	251*
Other Than Those Listed Above (see instrument description for respondent)	47 227 139* 257* 200 355* 205		15 156 25 161 41 388* 115	156 158 258*

*Contains some items particularly related to Special Education

For Assessing Characteristics of a PRESERVICE PRACTICUM see Index 1

INDEX NO. 7
ASSESSING CHARACTERISTICS OF A STUDENT IN A PRESERVICE COURSE OR PROGRAM

CELL ENTRIES REFER TO INSTRUMENT IDENTIFICATION NUMBERS AS LISTED IN THE FIRST SECTION OF THE CATALOG

WHO COMPLETES THE INSTRUMENT?	WHAT CHARACTERISTIC(S) DOES THE INSTRUMENT ATTEMPT TO INVESTIGATE?				
RESPONDENT(S)	SKILL/COMPETENCY (specific abilities related to program content)	KNOWLEDGE (general ability related to program area)	ATTITUDES/ PERCEPTIONS (feelings, opinions, etc., related to a program)	GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS (more than one characteristic is addressed)	OTHER CHARACTERISTICS THAN THOSE LISTED (see instrument description for characteristic)
Faculty Member	233* 238* 387*	229* 236* 229* 237* 230* 238* 231* 239* 232* 240* 234* 241*		170* 173	172*
Self (student in a course or program)	4* 206* 71 242* 204 291*	71 324* 207* 325* 217* 333* 244* 334* 247*	4 206* 242*	125* 170* 345*	2 35 69 155 271*
Other Than Those Listed Above (see instrument description for respondent)	154 214				172*

*Contains some items particularly related to Special Education

For Assessing Characteristics of a COURSE or PROGRAM see Index 2

INDEX NO. 8
ASSESSING CHARACTERISTICS OF GRADUATES ON THE JOB

CELL ENTRIES REFER TO INSTRUMENT IDENTIFICATION NUMBERS AS LISTED IN THE FIRST SECTION OF THE CATALOG

WHO COMPLETES THE INSTRUMENT?	WHAT SPECIAL EDUCATION CONTENT AREA IS ADDRESSED?							
	GENERAL SPECIAL EDUCATION Length of Instrument		COMMUNICATIVE DISORDERS Length of Instrument		OTHER SPECIAL EDUCATION AREA Length of Instrument		NO SPECIAL EDUCATION AREA IS ADDRESSED Length of Instrument	
RESPONDENT(S)	1-3 pages	4 or more pages	1-3 pages	4 or more pages	1-3 pages	4 or more pages	1-3 pages	4 or more pages
Employer	108 128 196 357 380	46 267 81 316 219 321	10 94 287	111			1 56 61 64 68 80	70 116 117 118 198
Self (graduated student)	27 132 28 209 58 270 106 372 127 374	19 245 51 266 107 315 126 322 175 373 195 381 243	21	92 93 110 286		178 317 343	20 59 63 201 356	48 49 50 72 197
Other Than Those Listed Above (see instrument description for respondent)						194	361	

INDEX NO. 9
ASSESSING CHARACTERISTICS OF PARTICIPANTS IN AN INSERVICE PROGRAM

CELL ENTRIES REFER TO INSTRUMENT IDENTIFICATION NUMBERS AS LISTED IN THE FIRST SECTION OF THE CATALOG

WHO COMPLETES THE INSTRUMENT?	WHAT CHARACTERISTIC(S) DOES THE INSTRUMENT INTEND TO ADDRESS?		
RESPONDENT(S)	SKILL/COMPETENCY (specific abilities related to program content)	ATTITUDES/PERCEPTIONS (feelings, opinions, etc. related to a program)	OTHER CHARACTERISTICS THAN THOSE LISTED (see instrument description for characteristics
Self (inservice participant)	142* 216* 147* 248	182 330	149* 193* 151* 382
Potential Inservice Participant		143 337* 376	
Other Than Those Listed Above (see instrument description for respondent)			344

*Contains some items particularly related to Special Education

For Assessing Characteristics of an INSERVICE PROGRAM see Index 3

INDEX NO. 10
SPECIAL RESEARCH INDEX

This index is designed for the Researcher not the Evaluator. It is a listing of the instruments contained in the ETC Instrument File grouped according to Content Area. The purpose here is to provide the Researcher (who is not focusing on a particular evaluation concern area) access to evaluation instruments being used in any one of several Special Education fields, or at a specific level in the educational system.

SPECIFIC CONTENT OR LEVEL	INSTRUMENT IDENTIFICATION NUMBERS
Communicative Disorders	3 102 233 258 5 104 234 259 10 110 235 275 14 111 239 280 21 145 240 286 37 193 241 287 52 216 252 288 92 217 253 289 93 218 254 290 94 228 255 291 98 229 256 320 100 232 257 385
Deaf/Blind	118 146 192
Emotionally Impaired	171
Gifted	276 277
Learning Disabled	55 230 238 363 157 236 362
Local Education Agencies (LEAs) (note: there may be other information useful to this area in Index 3)	26 74 202 310 29 83 220 311 45 101 279 312 55 134 294 359 60 135 304 362 62 179 305 383
Mentally Retarded	140 176 206 152 178
Physical Education/Recreation	130 147 148 154
Severely Multiply Disabled	116 207 213 272 117 208 220 313 189
State Education Agencies (SEAs)	136 185 215 283 140 186 274 284 141 187 276 285 142 188 278 288 144 189 280 311 152 190 281 351 163 191 282 384 184 192
Vocational Education	151 306

Instrument Number Name & Origin	Description of Instrument	The Respondent(s)	Item Format	Program Type	# of Pages	The Cost
1. **Administrator Rating of Teaching Staff** Department of Special Education West Liberty State College West Liberty, West Virginia	Questionnaire; general characteristics of a program graduate; on the job	Program administrator	Rating scale	Preservice	1	.25
2. **Advisement Data Form** Department of Special Education Western Michigan University Kalamazoo, Michigan	Cumulative record; student advisement process in general special education programs	Student; student advisor	Checklist	Preservice	1	.25
3. **Client Rating of Speech & Hearing Clinic** Department of Speech Portland State University Portland, Oregon	Questionnaire; direct services of a speech and hearing clinic	Parent	Comments/explanations; rating scale	Preservice	2	.30
4. **Competency-Based Pre Program Evaluation** Native American Special Education Training Program University of South Dakota Vermillion, South Dakota	Questionnaire; outcomes of courses in Native American Special Education; students' skill/competency levels and students' attitudes/ perceptions	Student	Rating scale	Preservice	6	.50
5. **Competencies Checklist** Department of Speech and Hearing College of St. Rose Albany, New York	Informal observation; measures general characteristics of student in the practicum; area of communicative disorders	Site supervisor	Checklist	Preservice	3	.35
6. **Core Program -Student Rating Program** Department of Elementary and Special Education Michigan State University Lansing, Michigan	Questionnaire; general characteristics of a program course	Student	Rating scale; comments	Preservice	2	.30

Instrument Number Name & Origin	Description of Instrument	The Respondent(s)	Item Format	Program Type	# of Pages	The Cost
7. **Course Evaluation** Department of Special Education University of Utah Salt Lake City, Utah	Informal observation form; student assessment of the general characteristics of a course instructor	Student	Comments/explanations; rating scale	Preservice	3	.35
8. **Criteria Listing of Behaviors** Department of Speech & Hearing Georgia State University Atlanta, Georgia	Formal observation; students' skills and competency levels in the practicum	Site supervisor	Comments/explanations; multiple choice	Preservice	2	.30
9. **Education Department Questionnaire** Department of Special Education West Liberty State College West Liberty, West Virginia	Questionnaire; general characteristics of the practicum	Student	Rating scale	Preservice	3	.35
10. **Employer Ratings of Graduates** Department of Speech Portland State University Portland, Oregon	Informal observation; general characteristics of a program graduate; on the job; area of communicative disorders	Employer	Rating scale	Preservice	2	.30
11. **Entry Survey of Students in NASEP** Native American Special Education Training Program University of South Dakota Vermillion, South Dakota	Questionnaire; student self-rating; in the curriculum	Student	Rating scale; short answer	Preservice	2	.30
12. **Evaluation Form for Practicum Students–Behavior Disorders** Department of Special Education Georgia State University Atlanta, Georgia	Formal observation; general characteristics of a practicum student; area of behavior disorders	Supervising teacher	Comments/explanations; rating scale	Preservice	3	.35

Instrument Number Name & Origin	Description of Instrument	The Respondent(s)	Item Format	Program Type	# of Pages	The Cost
13. Evaluation Guide Department of Special Education Valdosta State College Valdosta, Georgia	Formal observation; general characteristics of a practicum student	Supervising teacher	Rating scale	Preservice	1	.25
14. Evaluation of Clinical Practicum Speech & Hearing Clinic Portland State University Portland, Oregon	Formal observation; general characteristics of a practicum student; area of communicative disorders	Site supervisor	Rating scale	Preservice	2	.30
15. Evaluation of Student Practicum Department of Special Education Phillips University Enid, Oklahoma	Set of instruments; informal observation; general characteristics of a practicum student	Not specified	Rating scale	Preservice	3	.35
16. Exit Interview Form Department of Special Education University of Utah Salt Lake City, Utah	Questionnaire; skill/competency levels of a program graduate; outcomes of the program	Graduated student	Comments/explanations; multiple choice; rating scale; short answer	Preservice	9	.65
17. Field Experience Department of Special Education Western Michigan University Kalamazoo, Michigan	Cumulative record; descriptive information of a practicum for special education students	Student	Fill in the blank; checklist	Preservice	2	.30
18. Field Site Information Sheet Evaluation Research Center University of Virginia Charlottesville, Virginia	Questionnaire; preconditions/ resources of a practicum site for special education students	Site supervisor	Fill in the blank; checklist	Preservice	2	.30
19. Follow-up Evaluation Department of Special Education University of Utah Salt Lake City, Utah	Questionnaire; skill/competency levels of a program graduate; on the job	Graduated student	Comments/explanations; fill in the blank; rating scale; multiple choice	Preservice	8	.60

Instrument Number Name & Origin	Description of Instrument	The Respondent(s)	Item Format	Program Type	# of Pages	The Cost
20. **Follow-up Form** Department of Special Education West Liberty State College West Liberty, West Virginia	Questionnaire; demographic characteristics of a program graduate; on the job	Graduated student	Short answer	Preservice	1	.25
21. **Graduate Ratings of Program** Department of Speech Portland State University Portland, Oregon	Questionnaire; demographic information of program graduates; area of communicative disorders	Graduated student	Comments/explanations; rating scale; short answers	Preservice	2	.30
22. **Instructional Goals Validations** Department of Special Education Western Michigan University Kalamazoo, Michigan	Questionnaire; graduated students' rating of the instructional goals of program courses; area of general special education	Graduated student	Fill in the blank; rating scale	Preservice	6	.50
23. **Instructor and Course Evaluation** Department of Special Education Western Michigan University Kalamazoo, Michigan	Questionnaire; student rating of course instructor	Student	Rating scale	Preservice	2	.30
24. **Practicum Activities Time Log** Department of Elementary and Special Education Michigan State University East Lansing, Michigan	Cummulative record; how time is spent by the student in the practicum	Student	Fill in the blank	Preservice	2	.30
25. **Practicum Evaluation** Department of Special Education Western Michigan University Kalamazoo, Michigan	Formal observation; general characteristics of a student in practicum	Not specified	Rating scale	Preservice	2	.30
26. **Principal/Superintendent Interview Schedule** Illinois Office of Education Springfield, Illinois	Questionnaire; general characteristics of direct services provided by a Title I program	Program administrator	Short answer	Inservice	2	.30

Instrument Number Name & Origin	Description of Instrument	The Respondent(s)	Item Format	Program Type	# of Pages	The Cost
27. **Program Graduate Survey** Department of Special Education Western Michigan University Kalamazoo, Michigan	Questionnaire; general characteristics of program graduates; on the job; area of general special education	Graduated student	Multiple choice; short answer	Preservice	2	.30
28. **Program Graduate Survey** Department of Special Education The College of St. Rose Albany, New York	Questionnaire; general characteristics of a program graduate; on the job; area of general special education	Graduated student	Fill in the blank	Preservice	2	.30
29. **Rating of Program Competencies** Department of Special Education University of Utah Salt Lake City, Utah	Questionnaire and self-observation; attitudes/perceptions of classroom teachers; on-the-job situation; area of general special education	Teacher	Rating scale	Preservice; inservice	5	.45
30. **Site Supervisors' Ratings of Field Experience** Evaluation Research Center University of Virginia Charlottesville, Virginia	Informal observation; general characteristics of persons involved in the practicum; resources used in the practicum	Site supervisor	Rating scale	Preservice	8	.60
31. **Special Education Evaluation Form** Department of Special Education Chicago State University Chicago, Illinois	Informal observation; rating the general characteristics of practicum students	Supervising teacher	Rating scale	Preservice	6	.50
32. **Student Evaluation Instrument** Department of Special Education West Liberty State College West Liberty, West Virginia	Informal observation; general characteristics of a course instructor	Student	Rating scale; comments/ explanations	Preservice	2	.30
33. **Student Evaluation of Special Education Program** Department of Special Education Utah State University Logan, Utah	Set of instruments; questionnaire form; general characteristics of the course instructor; outcomes of the courses; area of general special education	Student	Comments/explanations; rating scale	Preservice	15	.95

Instrument Number Name & Origin	Description of Instrument	The Respondent(s)	Item Format	Program Type	# of Pages	The Cost
34. **Student Field Experience Record** Evaluation Research Center University of Virginia Charlottesville, Virginia	Cumulative record form; how time is spent by students in the practicum; area of general special education	Student	Comments/explanations; fill in the blank	Preservice	2	.30
35. **Student Information Form** Department of Special Education University of New Mexico Albuquerque, New Mexico	Questionnaire; demographic information on pre/post admission students	Student	Checklist	Preservice	5	.45
36. **Student Interview Schedule** Illinois Office of Education Springfield, Illinois	Interview system; attitudes/ perceptions of recipient of services in a youth center	Recipient of services	Comments/explanations	Inservice	1	.25
37. **Student Practicum/Speech Pathology** Department of Speech Pathology/ Audiology University of South Carolina Columbia, South Carolina	Set of instruments; formal observation; rating general characteristics of practicum student; area of communicative disorders	Site supervisor	Comments/explanations; rating scale	Preservice	7	.55
38. **Student Reaction to College Instructor** Department of Special Education Valdosta State College Valdosta, Georgia	Questionnaire; evaluation of course instructor	Student	Rating scale	Preservice	2	.30
39. **Student Teaching Evaluation** Department of Special Education Georgia State University Atlanta, Georgia	Formal observation; general characteristics of a practicum student	Supervising teacher	Rating scale	Preservice	5	.45
40. **Student Teaching Evaluation Set** Department of Speech and Drama Grambling State University Grambling, Louisiana	Set of instruments; general characteristics of programs and program sites	Multiple persons	Comments/explanations; fill in the blank; rating scale	Preservice	17	1.05

Instrument Number Name & Origin	Description of Instrument	The Respondent(s)	Item Format	Program Type	# of Pages	The Cost
41. **Student Teaching Observation Form** Department of Special Education University of Utah Salt Lake City, Utah	Formal observation; general characteristics of practicum students	Not specified	Checklist	Preservice	1	.25
42. **Supervising Teachers' Appraisal Form** Department of Special Education Georgia State University Atlanta, Georgia	Formal observation; general characteristics of practicum students	Supervising teacher	Rating scale	Preservice	1	.25
43. **Survey of Student Opinion of of Teaching** Department of Speech Portland State University Portland, Oregon	Questionnaire; attitudes and perceptions of a student toward a course instructor	Student	Comments/explanations; rating scale	Preservice	2	.30
44. **Teacher Survey** Department of Special Education Valdosta State University Valdosta, Georgia	Questionnaire; general characteristics of a course instructor	Student	Comments/explanations; rating scale	Preservice	1	.25
45. **Title I—Teacher Interview Schedule** Illinois Office of Education Springfield, Illinois	Interview form; general characteristics of direct services of a Title 1 program	Teacher in Title I program	Comments/explanations; essay	Inservice; state department	4	.40
46. **Survey of Graduate Job Performance** Evaluation Research Center University of Virginia Charlottesville, Virginia	Questionnaire; general characteristics of a program graduate in the employment situation	Employer	Comments/explanations; rating scale; checklist	Preservice	7	.55
47. **Practicum Evaluation Form** Department of Special Education Georgia State University Atlanta, Georgia	Formal observation; skill/competency levels of a practicum student	Not specified	Rating scale	Preservice	2	.30

Instrument Number Name & Origin	Description of Instrument	The Respondent(s)	Item Format	Program Type	# of Pages	The Cost
48. **Special Education Graduate Questionnaire** Department of Special Education Louisiana State University Baton Rouge, Louisiana	Questionnaire; general characteristics of a program graduate; on-the-job situation	Graduated student	Multiple choice; rating scale	Preservice	7	.55
49. **Graduate Follow-up Survey** Department of Special Education University of Michigan Ann Arbor, Michigan	Questionnaire; general characteristics of a program graduate; on-the-job situation	Graduated student	Multiple choice; checklist	Preservice	7	.55
50. **Instructional Technology Program** Department of Special Education Utah State University Logan, Utah	Questionnaire; general characteristics of current students and graduates	Graduated student	Comments/explanations; multiple choice; rating scale	Preservice	5	.45
51. **Graduate Follow-up Study** Department of Special Education Oakland University Rochester, Michigan	Questionnaire; skill/competency levels of a program graduate; on-the-job situation; area of general special education	Graduated student	Multiple choice; rating scale	Preservice	8	.60
52. **Student Audiological Practicum Ratings** University of Utah Salt Lake City, Utah	Informal observation; general characteristics of a practicum student; area of communicative disorders	Site supervisor	Rating scale	Preservice	3	.35
53. **Student Clinical Treatment Ratings** Speech and Hearing Clinic University of Utah Salt Lake City, Utah	Informal observation; general characteristics of a practicum student	Site supervisor	Rating scale	Preservice	2	.30
54. **Evaluation Form for Graduate Interns** Department of Special Education Virginia Commonwealth University Richmond, Virginia	Informal observation; general characteristics of a practicum student	Site supervisor	Comments/explanations; rating scale	Preservice	3	.35

Instrument Number Name & Origin	Description of Instrument	The Respondent(s)	Item Format	Program Type	# of Pages	The Cost
55. **Learning Disability Teacher–Consultant Survey** Glassboro State College Glassboro, New Jersey	Questionnaire; skill/competency levels; attitudes/perceptions of a teacher consultant; area of learning disabilities	Teacher consultant	Rating scale; short answer; ranking	Preservice; inservice	6	.50
56. **Graduate Rating Form** Southern Illinois University Carbondale, Illinois	Questionnaire; skill/competency levels of graduates; on-the-job situation	Employer	Rating scale	Preservice	3	.35
57. **Class Evaluation Questionnaire** University of North Florida Tampa, Florida	Questionnaire; outcomes of program courses	Student	Rating scale; short answer	Preservice	1	.25
58. **Graduate Questionnaire** University of Virginia Charlottesville, Virginia	Questionnaire; demographic information of program graduates in their job situation; area of general special education	Graduated student	Fill in the blank; multiple choice	Preservice	1	.25
59. **Survey of Graduate Students** University of North Florida Tampa, Florida	Questionnaire; attitudes/perceptions of a program graduate toward the job situation	Graduated student	Fill in the blank; rating scale	Preservice	3	.35
60. **Evaluation Form for Individualized Instruction** University of North Florida Tampa, Florida	Formal observation; skill/competency levels of a classroom teacher	Not specified	Checklist	Preservice; inservice	3	.35
61. **Survey of Graduates Employment Performance** University of North Florida Tampa, Florida	Informal observation; skill/competency levels of a program graduate; on-the-job situation	Employer	Rating scale; checklist	Preservice	2	.30
62. **Evaluation Form for Group Instruction** University of North Florida Tampa, Florida	Informal observation; general characteristics of a teacher; on-the-job situation	Not specified	Checklist	Preservice; inservice	3	.35

Instrument Number Name & Origin	Description of Instrument	The Respondent(s)	Item Format	Program Type	# of Pages	The Cost
63. **Graduate Questionnaire (Long Form)** University of Virginia Charlottesville, Virginia	Questionnaire; attitudes/ perceptions of a program graduate in their job situation	Graduated student	Short answer; checklist	Preservice	3	.35
64. **Graduate Supervisor Questionnaire** University of Virginia Charlottesville, Virginia	Informal observation; general characteristics of a program graduate; on-the-job situation	Employer	Essay; checklist	Preservice	2	.30
65. **Student Teaching and Practicum Evaluation (Student Form)** University of Virginia Charlottesville, Virginia	Questionnaire; general characteristics of a program practicum	Student	Essay; rating scale; short answer; checklist	Preservice	4	.40
66. **Student Teaching and Practicum Form (Supervisor)** University of Virginia Charlottesville, Virginia	Informal observation; general characteristics of a practicum student and resources of a program practicum	University supervisor	Rating scale; short answer; checklist	Preservice	4	.40
67. **Exit Interview Form** University of Utah Salt Lake City, Utah	Questionnaire; general characteristics of a program's courses	Graduated student	Comments/explanations; multiple choice; rating scale	Preservice	6	.50
68. **Teacher Evaluation** Lewis and Clark College Portland, Oregon	Informal observation; skill/ competency levels of a program graduate; on-the-job situation	Employer	Rating scale	Preservice; inservice	3	.35
69. **Entry Survey of Students** Sinclair Community College Dayton, Ohio	Questionnaire; qualifications of a student upon entering a program	Student	Multiple choice; rating scale	Preservice	5	.45
70. **Employer Rating of Graduate Job Performance** Sinclair Community College Dayton, Ohio	Informal observation; knowledge and skill/competency levels of a program graduate; on-the-job situation	Employer	Rating scale; checklist	Preservice; inservice	5	.45

Instrument Number Name & Origin	Description of Instrument	The Respondent(s)	Item Format	Program Type	# of Pages	The Cost
71. **Student Rating** Sinclair Community College Dayton, Ohio	Questionnaire; knowledge and skill/competency levels of students exiting the program	Graduated student	Rating scale	Preservice	5	.45
72. **Job Task Analysis Form** Temple University Philadelphia, Pennsylvania	Log for recording time spent by program graduates on various work tasks on the job	Graduated student	Rating scale; fill in the blank	Preservice	6	.50
73. **Manpower Survey** Temple University Philadelphia, Pennsylvania	Questionnaire; records information about agencies that may work cooperatively with the program e.g., as practicum sites	Program administrator	Comments/explanations; fill in the blank; checklist	Preservice	3	.35
74. **Mainstream Opinionaire** Edinboro State College Edinboro, Pennsylvania	Questionnaire; attitudes of teachers toward mainstreaming	School administrators; teachers	Rating scale	Preservice; inservice	4	.40
75. **Cooperating Teachers' Needs Assessment** Wheelock College Graduate Special Needs Program Wheelock College Boston, Massachusetts	Questionnaire; needs of the program practicum; area of general special education	Supervising teacher	Fill in the blank; rating scale; checklist; ranking	Preservice	5	.45
76. **Weekly Time Record** Wheelock College Graduate Special Needs Program Wheelock College Boston, Massachusetts	Cumulative record; changes/ progress of students in the practicum	Student	Fill in the blank	Preservice	4	.40
77. **Intern Rating Scale** Wheelock College Special Needs Program Wheelock College Boston, Massachusetts	Formal observation; skill/ competency levels of students in the practicum	Supervising teacher	Comments/explanations; rating scale	Preservice	23	1.35

Instrument Number Name & Origin	Description of Instrument	The Respondent(s)	Item Format	Program Type	# of Pages	The Cost
78. **Program Feedback Report** University of South Dakota Developmentally Disabled Vermillion, South Dakota	Questionnaire; general characteristics of inservice training	Inservice participant	Comments/explanations; rating scale; short answer	Inservice	1	.25
79. **Course Evaluation** Department of Special Education Kent State University Kent, Ohio	Questionnaire; general characteristics of a course instructor	Student	Rating scale	Preservice	1	.25
80. **Supervisor's Questionnaire for Program Evaluation for Special Education** Department of Special Education St. Cloud State University St. Cloud, Minnesota	Questionnaire; skill/competency levels of program graduates; on the job	Employer	Comments/explanations; fill in the blank; rating scale; checklist	Preservice	3	.35
81. **Employed Graduate Survey** North Seattle Community College Home & Family Education Division Seattle, Washington	Questionnaire; skill/competency levels of a program graduate; on-the-job situation; area of general special education	Employer	Comments/explanations; rating scale	Preservice	4	.40
82. **Practicum Record** North Seattle Community College Home & Family Education Division Seattle, Washington	Cumulative record; performance of students in the practicum	Student	Fill in the blank	Preservice	1	.25
83. **Rehabilitative School Authority Classroom Observation Report** Commonwealth of Virginia Rehabilitative School Authority Richmond, Virginia	Formal observation; performance of a classroom teacher	Observer/consultant	Comments/explanations	Inservice	1	.25

Instrument Number Name & Origin	Description of Instrument	The Respondent(s)	Item Format	Program Type	# of Pages	The Cost
84. **Student Teaching Evaluation Competency Forms: Special Education** Lock Haven State College Lock Haven, Pennsylvania	Informal observation; skill/competency levels of a practicum student; area of general special education	Supervising teacher	Checklist	Preservice	3	.35
85. **Student Teaching Evaluation Competency Forms: Elementary** Lock Haven State College Lock Haven, Pennsylvania	Informal observation; skill/competency levels of a practicum student	Supervising teacher	Comments/explanations; rating scale	Preservice	9	.65
86. **Student Teaching Evaluation Competency Forms: Library Science** Lock Haven State College Lock Haven, Pennsylvania	Questionnaire; skills and competency levels of a practicum student	Supervising teacher	Rating scale	Preservice	10	.70
87. **Student Teaching Evaluation Competency Forms: Early Childhood** Lock Haven State College Lock Haven, Pennsylvania	Questionnaire; skill/competency levels of a practicum student; area of early childhood education	Supervising teacher	Rating scale; short answer	Preservice	10	.70
88. **Student Teaching Evaluation Competency Forms: English/Communication** Lock Haven State College Lock Haven, Pennsylvania	Questionnaire, general characteristics of a practicum student	Supervising teacher	Comments/explanations	Preservice	10	.70
89. **Student Teaching Evaluation Competency Forms: Foreign Language** Lock Haven State College Lock Haven, Pennsylvania	Questionnaire; skill/competency levels of practicum students	Supervising teacher	Comments/explanations; multiple choice; short answer	Preservice	11	.75

Instrument Number Name & Origin	Description of Instrument	The Respondent(s)	Item Format	Program Type	# of Pages	The Cost
90. **Student Teaching Evaluation Competency Forms: Science** Lock Haven State College Lock Haven, Pennsylvania	Questionnaire; skill/competency levels of a practicum student; area of science in secondary education	Supervising teacher	Checklist	Preservice	9	.65
91. **Student Teaching Evaluation Competency Forms: Social Science** Lock Haven State College Lock Haven, Pennsylvania	Questionnaire, skill/competency levels of a practicum student	Supervising teacher	Comments/explanations; rating scale	Preservice	8	.60
92. **Communicative Disorders Graduate Follow-up Form** Department of Communicative Disorders University of Wisconsin Eau Claire, Wisconsin	Questionnaire; general characteristics of program graduates; on-the-job situation; area of communicative disorders	Graduated student	Comments/explanations; fill in the blank; rating scale; short answer	Preservice	4	.40
93. **Graduate Follow-up Form** Department of Communicative Disorders University of Wisconsin Eau Claire, Wisconsin	Questionnaire; general characteristics of a program graduate; on-the-job situation; area of communicative disorders	Graduated student	Comments/explanations; fill in the blank; short answer; rating scale	Preservice	7	.55
94. **Employer Evaluation of Graduate** Department of Communicative Disorders University of Wisconsin Eau Claire, Wisconsin	Questionnaire; general characteristics of a program graduate; on-the-job situation; area of communicative disorders	Employer	Rating scale	Preservice	2	.30
95. **Student Evaluation of Teaching** Department of Communicative Disorders University of Wisconsin Eau Claire, Wisconsin	Questionnaire; general characteristics of a course instructor	Student	Rating scale	Preservice	1	.25

Instrument Number Name & Origin	Description of Instrument	The Respondent(s)	Item Format	Program Type	# of Pages	The Cost
96. **Supervisee's Impressions Summary** Department of Communicative Disorders University of Wisconsin Eau Claire, Wisconsin	Questionnaire; general characteristics of the supervising teacher; at practicum site	Student	Rating scale	Preservice	1	.25
97. **Consultant Evaluation--End of Year** Department of Communicative Disorders University of Wisconsin Eau Claire, Wisconsin	Questionnaire; general characteristics of professional support services	Site supervisor	Comments/explanations; short answer	Inservice	1	.25
98. **Consultant Evaluation--Individual Client** Department of Communicative Disorders University of Wisconsin Eau Claire, Wisconsin	Questionnaire; attitudes/perceptions of a program staff member; outcomes of professional support services; area of communicative disorders	Faculty member	Rating scale	Preservice; inservice	1	.25
99. **Inservice Evaluation--Public School Clinicians** Department of Communicative Disorders University of Wisconsin Eau Claire, Wisconsin	Questionnaire, general characteristics of inservice training	Inservice participant	Rating scale; short answer	Inservice	2	.30
100. **Inservice Evaluation--Department of Communicative Disorders Faculty** Department of Communicative Disorders University of Wisconsin Eau Claire, Wisconsin	Questionnaire; adequacy of the evaluation of inservice training; area of communicative disorders	Inservice staff member	Short answer	Inservice	1	.25

Instrument Number Name & Origin	Description of Instrument	The Respondent(s)	Item Format	Program Type	# of Pages	The Cost
101. **Liason Evaluation—End of Year** Department of Communicative Disorders University of Wisconsin Eau Claire, Wisconsin	Questionnaire; outcomes of professional support services	Multiple persons	Comments/explanations	Local district	1	.25
102. **Practicum Evaluations: Semester/Clinicians** Department of Communicative Disorders University of Wisconsin Eau Claire, Wisconsin	Questionnaire; skill/competency levels of a practicum student; area of communicative disorders	Site supervisor	Rating scale; short answer	Preservice	2	.30
103. **Practicum Evaluations: Semester/Principals** Department of Communicative Disorders University of Wisconsin Eau Claire, Wisconsin	Questionnaire; general characteristics of a practicum student	Site supervisor	Essay	Preservice	1	.25
104. **Practicum Evaluations: End of Year/Clinicians** Department of Communicative Disorders University of Wisconsin Eau Claire, Wisconsin	Interview form; general characteristics of a practicum student; and the practicum itself; area of communicative disorders	Supervising teacher	Comments/explanations	Preservice	1	.25
105. **Practicum Evaluations: End of Year/University Supervisors** Department of Communicative Disorders University of Wisconsin Eau Claire, Wisconsin	Questionnaire; qualifications of practicum students; outcomes of the practicum	Supervising teacher	Comments/explanations; short answer	Preservice; state department	1	.25
106. **Program Graduate Information Form** Department of Special Education Pennsylvania State University University Park, Pennsylvania	Questionnaire; general characteristics of a program graduate; on-the-job situation; area of general special education	Graduated student	Fill in the blank; multiple choice; short answer; checklist	Preservice	3	.35

Instrument Number Name & Origin	Description of Instrument	The Respondent(s)	Item Format	Program Type	# of Pages	The Cost
107. **Program Evaluation Form** Department of Special Education Pennsylvania State University University Park, Pennsylvania	Questionnaire; skill/competency levels of a program graduate; on-the-job situation; outcomes of program courses; area of general special education	Graduated student	Comments/explanations; fill in the blank; rating scale	Preservice	5	.45
108. **Supervisor's Evaluation of Program Graduates Form** Department of Special Education Pennsylvania State University University Park, Pennsylvania	Questionnaire; skill/competency levels of a program graduate; on-the-job situation; area of general special education	Employer	Rating scale	Preservice	2	.30
109. **Standardized Evaluative Opinionnaire** Department of Public Instruction Des Moines, Iowa	Questionnaire; general characteristics of inservice training	Inservice participant	Rating scale; short answer	Inservice	2	.30
110. **Graduate Program Survey** Audiology/Speech Pathology University of Pittsburgh Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania	Questionnaire, demographic information of program graduates; on-the-job situation; effectiveness of the program's courses; area of communicative disorders	Graduated student	Fill in the blank; rating scale; checklist	Preservice	6	.50
111. **Employer Survey of Program Graduates** Audiology/Speech Pathology University of Pittsburgh Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania	Questionnaire; skill/competency levels of program graduates; on-the-job situation; area of communicative disorders	Employer	Rating scale	Preservice	6	.50
112. **Program Evaluation** Department of Special Education Indiana State University Terre Haute, Indiana	Questionnaire; general characteristics of program courses; area of general special education	Student	Essay	Preservice	2	.30
113. **Staff (Interview Schedule)** Department of Special Education Indiana State University Terre Haute, Indiana	Interview form; general characteristics of the academic program	Faculty member	Short answer	Preservice	1	.25

Instrument Number Name & Origin	Description of Instrument	The Respondent(s)	Item Format	Program Type	# of Pages	The Cost
114. **Agency School Supervisor Interview Schedule** Department of Special Education Indiana State University Terre Haute, Indiana	Interview form; actual process of the general program design	Supervising teacher	Short answer	Preservice	1	.25
115. **Proposed Rating Scale for Student Psychometrists** Department of Special Education Indiana State University Terre Haute, Indiana	Questionnaire; general characteristics of a practicum student	Not specified	Comments/explanations; rating scale	Preservice	2	.30
116. **Competency Rating Scale (M.S.—Teaching Multiply Handicapped)** Northern Illinois University Dekalb, Illinois	Set of instruments; questionnaire form; skill/competency levels of program graduates; skills acquired to be used on the job in the areas of severely multiply disabled and deaf/blind	Employer; graduated student	Multiple choice; rating scale	Preservice	9	.65
117. **Competency Rating Scale (M.S.—Orientation and Mobility Specialist)** Northern Illinois University Dekalb, Illinois	Set of instruments; questionnaire form; skill/competency levels of program graduates; skills acquired to be used on the job in the areas of severely multiply disabled and deaf/blind	Employer; graduated student	Multiple choice; rating scale	Preservice	12	.80
118. **Competency Rating Scale (Regency Doctoral Program)** Northern Illinois University Dekalb, Illinois	Set of instruments; questionnaire form; skill/competency levels of program graduates; skills acquired to be used on the job in the area of deaf/blind	Employer; graduated student	Multiple choice; rating scale	Preservice	12	.80
119. **Student Teacher Self-Evaluation Form Ia** Department of Special Education Eastern Michigan University Ypsilanti, Michigan	Questionnaire; general characteristics of a practicum student, area of general special education	Student	Rating scale; checklist	Preservice	5	.45

Instrument Number Name & Origin	Description of Instrument	The Respondent(s)	Item Format	Program Type	# of Pages	The Cost
120. **Critic Teacher Evaluation Form Ib** Department of Special Education Eastern Michigan University Ypsilanti, Michigan	Questionnaire; general characteristics of a practicum student; area of general special education	Supervising teacher	Rating scale	Preservice	4	.40
121. **Program Evaluation Form Ic** Department of Special Education Eastern Michigan University Ypsilanti, Michigan	Questionnaire; outcomes of program courses; area of general special education	Student	Rating scale; ranking	Preservice	4	.40
122. **Graduate Student Self-Evaluation Form IIa** Department of Special Education Eastern Michigan University Ypsilanti, Michigan	Questionnaire; general characteristics of a practicum student; area of general special education	Student	Rating scale; matched answers	Preservice	5	.45
123. **Program Evaluation Form IIc** Department of Special Education Eastern Michigan University Ypsilanti, Michigan	Questionnaire; outcomes of program courses; area of general special education	Graduated student	Rating scale; ranking	Preservice	4	.40
124. **Supervisor Evaluation Form IIb** Department of Special Education Eastern Michigan University Ypsilanti, Michigan	Questionnaire; general characteristics of a student in the practicum; area of general special education	Site supervisor	Rating scale; checklist	Preservice	6	.50
125. **Graduate Student Form III** Department of Special Education Eastern Michigan University Ypsilanti, Michigan	Questionnaire; general characteristics of students in the program; area of general special education	Student	Checklist	Preservice	2	.30
126. **Special Education Graduate Record System** Fort Hays State University Hays, Kansas	Questionnaire; demographic information of graduated students; on-the-job situation; area of general special education	Graduated student	Checklist	Preservice	5	.45

Instrument Number Name & Origin	Description of Instrument	The Respondent(s)	Item Format	Program Type	# of Pages	The Cost
127. **Survey of Program Graduates (A)** Fort Hays State University Hays, Kansas	Questionnaire; general characteristics of a program graduate; on-the-job situation; area of general special education	Graduated student	Fill in the blank; multiple choice	Preservice	2	.30
128. **Employer Survey** Fort Hays State University Hays, Kansas	Questionnaire; skill/competency levels of a program graduate; on-the-job situation; area of general special education	Employer	Rating scale	Preservice	2	.30
129. **Final Field Work Evaluation for Leisure Studies 282-283** University of Illinois at Urbana–Champaign Champaign, Illinois	Questionnaire; skill/competency levels of a practicum student	Supervising teacher	Rating scale	Preservice	2	.30
130. **Mid-term Evaluation Report for Leisure Studies 282-283** University of Illinois at Urbana- Champaign Champaign, Illinois	Questionnaire; general characteristics of a practicum student; area of physical education/recreation	Site supervisor	Short answer	Preservice	4	.40
131. **System for Evaluation of Occupational Programs** Manchester Community College Manchester, Connecticut	Evaluation system; formal observation; general characteristics of a program design	Consultant/observer	Comments/explanations; rating scale; short answer	Preservice	18	1.10
132. **Graduate Questionnaire** Department of Special Education University of Wisconsin Eau Claire, Wisconsin	Questionnaire; general characteristics of a program graduate; on-the-job situation; area of general special education	Graduated student	Fill in the blank; multiple choice	Preservice	3	.35
133. **Graduate Evaluation by Supervisor** Department of Special Education University of Wisconsin Eau Claire, Wisconsin	Questionnaire; general characteristics of a practicum student; area of general special education	Supervising teacher	Rating scale	Preservice	3	.35

Instrument Number Name & Origin	Description of Instrument	The Respondent(s)	Item Format	Program Type	# of Pages	The Cost
134. **Trainable Achievement Record** Caswell Center Kingston, North Carolina	Formal observation; knowledge and skill/competency levels of a child in development	Examiner	Fill in the blank	School testing	Copyrighted material	Not available through ETC
135. **Behavior Maturity Checklist** Caswell Center Kingston, North Carolina	Formal observation; skill/competency levels of a child in behavior development	Examiner	Checklist	School testing	Copyrighted material	Not available through ETC
136. **State Board of Education Rules Chapter 6A-5** State of Florida Commissioner of Education Tallahassee, Florida	Rules of the State Board of Education in Florida regarding approval of teacher education programs			Preservice; inservice; state department	7	.55
137. **Training Session Evaluation Questionnaire** John C. Calhoun State Community College Decatur, Alabama	Questionnaire; actual processes of inservice training	Inservice participant	Rating scale; short answer	Preservice; inservice	1	.25
138. **Instructor Evaluation Scale** John C. Calhoun State Community College Decatur, Alabama	Questionnaire; general charaacteristics of a course instructor	Student	Fill in the blank; multiple choice; rating scale	Preservice	1	.25
139. **Report on Student Performance** John C. Calhoun State Community College Decatur, Alabama	Questionnaire; skill/competency levels of a practicum student; area of general special education	Supervising teacher student	Comments/explanations; fill in the blank; rating scale; short answer	Preservice	7	.55
140. **IPP Evaluation Checklist: IPP Completeness and Presence of Developmental Objectives (Community Version)** Department of Institutions Division for Developmental Disabilities Denver, Colorado	Evaluation system; general characteristics of a program or site; area of mentally retarded	Program administrator	Checklist	State department	43	2.35

Instrument Number Name & Origin	Description of Instrument	The Respondent(s)	Item Format	Program Type	# of Pages	The Cost
141. **Survey of Individual Program Plans (Institutional Version)** Department of Institutions Division for Developmental Disabilities Denver, Colorado	Evaluation system; cumulative record; general characteristics of professional support services; area of developmental disabilities	Not specified	Checklist	State department	14	.90
142. **Regular Education Inservice Training Checklist and Questionnaire** Region XIX El Paso, Texas	Questionnaire; skill/competency and knowledge levels of workshop participants; area of general special education	Inservice/workshop participant	Essay; rating scale	Preservice; inservice; state department	2	.30
143. **Regular Education Concern Based Adoption Model** Region XIX El Paso, Texas	Questionnaire; attitudes and perceptions of potential inservice participants	Potential inservice participant	Fill in the blank; multiple choice; rating scale	Inservice	7	.55
144. **Workshop Evaluation Form** Region XIX El Paso, Texas	Questionnaire; general characteristics of inservice training	Inservice participant	Fill in the blank; rating scale	Inservice; state department	2	.30
145. **Chabot College Speech and Hearing Center 1979 Evaluation** Chabot College Hayward, California	Questionnaire; outcomes of speech therapy services; area of communicative disorders	Recipient of services	Comments/explanations; multiple choice	Preservice	3	.35
146. **Chabot College Physically Limited Student Resource Center 1979 Evaluation** Chabot College Hayward, California	Questionnaire; general characteristics of services offered by a center; area of deaf/blind and physically limited	Recipient of services	Comments/explanations; multiple choice; checklist	Preservice	4	.40

Instrument Number Name & Origin	Description of Instrument	The Respondent(s)	Item Format	Program Type	# of Pages	The Cost
147. **Pre-Workshop Inventory** Department of Health, Physical Education and Recreation Montana State University Bozeman, Montana	Questionnaire; knowledge and skill/competency levels of workshop participants; area of physical education/recreation	Inservice/workshop participant	Rating scale	Inservice	3	.35
148. **Post Workshop Inventory** Department of Health, Physical Education and Recreation Montana State University Bozeman, Montana	Questionnaire; actual processes of inservice training; area of physical education/recreation	Inservice participant	Rating scale	Inservice	2	.30
149. **Follow-up Participant Questionnaire** Department of Health, Physical Education and Recreation Montana State University Bozeman, Montana	Questionnaire; general characteristics of an inservice participant; general characteristics of inservice training; area of physical education/recreation	Inservice participant	Comments/explanations; rating scale; short answer	Inservice	1	.25
150. **Preschool Pupil Progress Evaluation Plan** Panhandle Child Development Association Incorporated Cour d'Alene, Idaho	Set of instruments; formal observations; skill/competency levels of preschool age children in motor, cognitive, social self-help and language skills	Teacher	Comments/explanations; fill in the blank; multiple choice; short answer	Preservice; inservice; preschool programs	Copyrighted material	Not available through ETC
151. **Goal Attainment Follow-up Guide** University of Northern Colorado Greeley, Colorado	Data aggregation chart; job performance of an inservice participant, area of vocational education	Inservice participant	Fill in the blank	Inservice	1	.25
152. **Community Survey Form** Oklahoma Association for Retarded Citizens Incorporated Oklahoma City, Oklahoma	Set of instruments; questionnaire form; processes of community services; area of mentally retarded	Not specified	Short answer	Preservice; inservice; state department	15	.95

Instrument Number Name & Origin	Description of Instrument	The Respondent(s)	Item Format	Program Type	# of Pages	The Cost
153. **Evaluation Form for Personnel Development Activities** State of Michigan Department of Education Special Education Services Lansing, Michigan	Questionnaire; general characteristics of inservice training; area of general special education	Inservice participant	Fill in the blank; rating scale; short answer	Inservice	4	.40
154. **Competency List and Self-Evaluation** State of New Jersey Department of Community Affairs Trenton, New Jersey	Objective test; pre and post skills and competency levels of a student in the program; area of physical education/recreation	Not specified	Rating scale; checklist	Preservice; inservice	4	.40
155. **Undergraduate Course Projection** Special Education Speech and Hearing University of Michigan Ann Arbor, Michigan	Cumulative record; changes/progress in a student's program; area of general special education	Student	Fill in the blank; multiple choice	Preservice	2	.30
156. **Initial Information Form** Special Education Speech and Hearing University of Michigan Ann Arbor, Michigan	Cumulative record; general characteristics of a practicum student; general characteristics of a program practicum	Faculty member	Comments/explanations; fill in the blank; short answer	Preservice	1	.25
157. **Program in Learning Disabilities Field Placement Evaluation** Special Education Speech and Hearing University of Michigan Ann Arbor, Michigan	Questionnaire; skill/competency levels of a practicum student; area of learning disabilities	Site supervisor	Rating scale	Preservice	9	.65
158. **Field Placement Letter** Special Education Speech and Hearing University of Michigan Ann Arbor, Michigan	Letter for announcing placement of a student to a practicum site			Preservice	1	25

Instrument Number Name & Origin	Description of Instrument	The Respondent(s)	Item Format	Program Type	# of Pages	The Cost
159. **Description of Practica** Special Education Speech and Hearing University of Michigan Ann Arbor, Michigan	Description of the practica and courses in the special education program			Preservice	2	.30
160. **Program and Supervision Evaluation Form** Special Education Speech and Hearing University of Michigan Ann Arbor, Michigan	Questionnaire; general characteristics of a program practicum	Student	Rating scale; short answer	Preservice	2	.30
161. **Evaluation of Teaching Competencies** Special Education Speech and Hearing University of Michigan Ann Arbor, Michigan	Questionnaire; general characteristics of a practicum student	Supervising teacher; student	Comments/explanations; short answer; ranking	Preservice	4	.40
162. **Faculty Coordinator's Summary Sheet Parts I & II** Special Education Speech and Hearing University of Michigan Ann Arbor, Michigan	Cumulative record; resources of the program practicum	Program administrator	Fill in the blank; checklist	Preservice	2	.30
163. **Field Placement Supervising Teacher List** Special Education Speech and Hearing University of Michigan Ann Arbor, Michigan	Cumulative record; preconditions for placement in an internship or practicum	Program administrator	Fill in the blank	Preservice; state department	1	.25

Instrument Number Name & Origin	Description of Instrument	The Respondent(s)	Item Format	Program Type	# of Pages	The Cost
164. **Final Report on Trainee by Field Supervisor** Special Education Speech and Hearing University of Michigan Ann Arbor, Michigan	Questionnaire; general characteristics of a practicum student; area of general special education	Site supervisor	Essay	Preservice	2	.30
165. **Trainee's Evaluation of Supervisor and Field Experience** Special Education Speech and Hearing University of Michigan Ann Arbor, Michigan	Questionnaire; attitudes/perceptions of a student toward the supervising teacher; practicum situation; area of general special education	Student	Comments/explanations; fill in the blank; rating scale; checklist	Preservice	3	.35
166. **Supervisor's Self-Evaluation Form** Special Education Speech and Hearing University of Michigan Ann Arbor, Michigan	Questionnaire; skill/competency levels of a site supervisor	Site supervisor	Rating scale; short answer	Preservice	2	.30
167. **Observation of a Teaching Situation Form** Special Education Speech and Hearing University of Michigan Ann Arbor, Michigan	Informal observation; general characteristics of a practicum student	Supervising teacher	Comments/explanations; fill in the blank; multiple choice	Preservice	2	.30
168. **Faculty Coordinator's Evaluation of Supervisor** Special Education Speech and Hearing University of Michigan Ann Arbor, Michigan	Informal observation; general characteristics of the supervising teacher; at a practicum site	Program administrator	Comments/explanations; rating scale; checklist	Preservice	5	.45

Instrument Number Name & Origin	Description of Instrument	The Respondent(s)	Item Format	Program Type	# of Pages	The Cost
169. **Evaluation of Special Education Internship Program** Special Education Speech and Hearing University of Michigan Ann Arbor, Michigan	Questionnaire; actual processes of a program practicum	Student	Comments/explanations; rating scale; short answer	Preservice	5	.45
170. **Doctoral Students' Progress Report with Cover Letter** Special Education Speech and Hearing University of Michigan Ann Arbor, Michigan	Questionnaire; general characteristics of a doctoral student; area of general special education	Student; student advisor	Comments/explanations; short answer; checklist	Preservice	6	.50
171. **Course Planning Sheet** Special Education Speech and Hearing University of Michigan Ann Arbor, Michigan	Cumulative record form; actual processes of program courses; area of emotionally disturbed	Student; student advisor	Checklist	Preservice	2	.30
172. **Research Committee Evaluation Sheet** Special Education Speech and Hearing University of Michigan Ann Arbor, Michigan	Questionnaire; general characteristics of doctoral research reports; area of general special education	Student advisor	Comments/explanations; fill in the blank; short answer	Preservice	1	.25
173. **Preliminary Examination Report** Special Education Speech and Hearing University of Michigan Ann Arbor, Michigan	Cumulative record; performance of students in the program	Faculty member	Comments/explanations; fill in the blank; rating scale	Preservice	1	.25

Instrument Number Name & Origin	Description of Instrument	The Respondent(s)	Item Format	Program Type	# of Pages	The Cost
174. **Doctoral Student Program Evaluation Form** Special Education Speech and Hearing University of Michigan Ann Arbor, Michigan	Questionnaire; demographic information of students in the program; actual processes of program courses, area of general special education	Student	Comments; fill in the blank; rating scale; short answer; checklist; ranking	Preservice	9	.65
175. **Alumni Program Evaluation Form** Special Education Speech and Hearing University of Michigan Ann Arbor, Michigan	Questionnaire; demographic information of program graduates; on-the-job situation; general characteristics of the program's courses; area of general special education	Graduated student	Rating scale; short answer	Preservice	9	.65
176. **Parent Feedback Form** Institute for the Study of Mental Retardation and Related Disabilities University of Michigan Ann Arbor, Michigan	Questionnaire; general characteristics of direct services; area of mentally retarded	Parent	Multiple choice; short answer	Inservice	3	.35
177. **Consultant Feedback Form** Institute for the Study of Mental Retardation and Related Disabilities University of Michigan Ann Arbor, Michigan	Questionnaire; outcomes of professional support services; area of general special education	Faculty member; agency administrator	Multiple choice; rating scale	Inservice; human service agency	3	.35
178. **Training Assessment Follow-up Form** Institute for the Study of Mental Retardation and Related Disabilities University of Michigan Ann Arbor, Michigan	Questionnaire; general characteristics of a graduated student; description of the job setting; area of mentally retarded	Graduated student	Multiple choice; rating scale; short answer	Preservice	5	.45

Instrument Number Name & Origin	Description of Instrument	The Respondent(s)	Item Format	Program Type	# of Pages	The Cost
179. **Mainstreaming Inventory** Special Education University of Northern Colorado Greeley, Colorado	Questionnaire; attitudes and perceptions of a classroom teacher toward mainstreaming	Teacher; future teacher	Rating scale	Inservice; preservice	7	.55
180. **Student Activity Evaluation** Special Education University of Northern Colorado Greeley, Colorado	Questionnaire; general characteristics of program course activities	Student	Rating scale	Preservice	3	.35
181. **Instructor Activity Evaluation** Special Education University of Northern Colorado Greeley, Colorado	Set of instruments; questionnaire form; actual processes of program course activities	Student	Comments/explanations; rating scale	Preservice	2	.30
182. **Pre-session Self-Appraisal Form** Parent Educational Advocacy Training Center Alexandria, Virginia	Questionnaire; knowledge and attitudes/perceptions of parents prior to a workshop	Parent	Rating scale; short answer	Inservice	4	.40
183. **Post-session Self-Appraisal Form** Parent Educational Advocacy Training Center Alexandria, Virginia	Questionnaire; parent knowledge and attitudes within the context of a workshop; area of general special education	Parent	Rating scale; short answer	Parent training	5	.45
184. **Annual Survey Form** Kansas State Department of Education Topeka, Kansas	Records analysis; costs of a program; area of general special education	Program administrator	Fill in the blank	State department	3	.35
185. **Forms for Reporting Personnel** Kansas State Department of Education Topeka, Kansas	Questionnaire; activities log of a program staff member; on the job	Program administrator	Fill in the blank	State department	2	.30

Instrument Number Name & Origin	Description of Instrument	The Respondent(s)	Item Format	Program Type	# of Pages	The Cost
186. **Approval and Compliance Report** Kansas State Department of Education Topeka, Kansas	Questionnaire; general characteristics of a plan for program operation; area of general special education	School administrator; state department personnel	Checklist	State department	6	.50
187. **Count of Exceptional Children** Kansas State Department of Education Topeka, Kansas	Cumulative record; preconditions/ resources of the job situation; area of general special education	Program administrator	Fill in the blank	State department	4	.40
188. **End-of-Year Report** Kansas State Department of Education Topeka, Kansas	Cumulative record; resources of the job situation; area of general special education	Program administrator	Fill in the blank	State department	4	.40
189. **SMH/DB on Site Visit Questionnaire and Year Ending Forms** Kansas State Department of Education Topeka, Kansas	Questionnaire; general characteristics of students in school; actual processes of teaching in the school; area of general special education	Multiple persons	Comments/explanations; short answer; rating scale	State department	14	.90
190. **Paraprofessional Program Evaluation System** Kansas State Department of Education Topeka, Kansas	Evaluation system; multiple modes of measurement; skill/competency levels of program staff members; general characteristics of inservice training; area of general special education	Multiple persons	Rating scale; short answer; checklist	State department	17	1.05
191. **School Annual Report** Kansas State Department of Education Topeka, Kansas	Questionnaire; qualifications of a program staff member	Psychologist; social worker	Comments/explanations; short answer	Inservice; state department	2	.30
192. **Registration of Deaf/Blind** Kansas State Department of Education Topeka, Kansas	Questionnaire; general characteristics of students within a school district; area of deaf/blind	Not specified	Multiple choice; short answer	State department	1	.25

Instrument Number Name & Origin	Description of Instrument	The Respondent(s)	Item Format	Program Type	# of Pages	The Cost
193. **End-of-Year Report—Language, Speech, Hearing** Kansas State Department of Education Topeka, Kansas	Questionnaire; general characteristics of an inservice participant; on-the-job situation; area of communicative disorders	Inservice participant	Fill in the blank	Inservice	6	.50
194. **Early Childhood Education Checklist** Kansas State Department of Education Topeka, Kansas	Informal observation; general characteristics of an employment situation; area of early childhood handicapped	Consultant/observer	Comments/explanations; fill in the blank	Inservice	9	.65
195. **Student Questionnaire for Program Evaluation** Department of Special Education St. Cloud State University St. Cloud, Minnesota	Questionnaire; demographic information of program graduates; outcomes of a program's design; area of general special education	Graduated student	Comments/explanations; multiple choice; rating scale	Preservice	6	.50
196. **Supervisors' Questionnaire for Program Evaluation** Department of Special Education St. Cloud State University St. Cloud, Minnesota	Questionnaire; skill/competency levels of a program graduate; on-the-job situation; area of general special education	Employer	Multiple choice; rating scale	Preservice	3	.35
197. **Special Education Follow-up Evaluation** Special Education University of Utah Salt Lake City, Utah	Questionnaire; knowledge and skill/competency levels of a program graduate; on-the-job situation	Graduated student	Fill in the blank; rating scale	Preservice	8	.60
198. **Special Education Employer Evaluation of Program Graduates** Special Education University of Utah Salt Lake City, Utah	Questionnaire; knowledge and skill/competency levels of a program graduate; on-the-job situation	Employer	Fill in the blank; rating scale	Preservice	6	50

Instrument Number Name & Origin	Description of Instrument	The Respondent(s)	Item Format	Program Type	# of Pages	The Cost
199. **Mainstream Inservice Team (MIST) Activity Evaluation Forms** Toms River Schools Toms River, New Jersey	Objective test; general characteristics of an inservice training program	Multiple persons	Rating scale	Inservice	2	.30
200. **Observation Checklist for Student Teaching** School of Education University of Denver Denver, Colorado	Informal observation; skill/competency levels of a practicum student	Consultant/observer	Rating scale; checklist	Preservice	5	.45
201. **Graduate Follow-up Questionnaire** School of Education University of Denver Denver, Colorado	Questionnaire; general characteristics of program graduates; on-the-job situation	Graduated student	Comments/explanations; essay; multiple choice; rating scale	Preservice	2	.30
202. **Refined Scale: Attitude Toward Mainstreaming** Clinical Services University of Arkansas Fayetteville, Arkansas	Questionnaire; attitudes/perceptions of mainstreaming; with report findings	Faculty members; students; classroom teachers	Rating scale	Preservice; inservice	7	.55
203. **Consultant Evaluation Form** University of the District of Columbia Washington, D.C.	Questionnaire; processes and resources of mini-courses	Consultant/observer	Comments/explanations; fill in the blank; rating scale	Preservice; inservice	2	.30
204. **Instructional Module Checklist** University of the District of Columbia Washington, D.C.	Set of instruments; skill/competency levels of students in the course	Student	Rating scale; short answer	Preservice	19	1.15

92

Instrument Number Name & Origin	Description of Instrument	The Respondent(s)	Item Format	Program Type	# of Pages	The Cost
205. **Site Observation Recording Form** University of the District of Columbia Washington, D.C.	Questionnaire; measuring skill/ competency levels of a practicum student	Examiner	Rating scale; short answer	Preservice; inservice	1	.25
206. **Evaluation of CPI Workshop** University of the District of Columbia Washington, D.C.	Questionnaire, skill/competency levels and attitudes/perceptions toward a course, and the actual processes of the course; area of mentally retarded	Student	Comments/explanations; rating scale	Preservice; inservice	3	.35
207. **Final Examination** University of the District of Columbia Washington, D.C.	Objective test; knowledge level of a student; area of severely multiply disabled	Student	Essay; multiple choice	Preservice	5	45
208. **Student Evaluation of Faculty Observation** University of the District of Columbia Washington, D.C.	Questionnaire; skill/competency levels of the supervising teacher at a practicum site; area of severely multiply disabled	Student	Rating scale; short answer	Preservice	1	.25
209. **Graduate Follow-up Survey** University of the District of Columbia Washington, D.C.	Questionnaire; skill/competency levels and attitudes/perceptions of a program graduate; on-the-job situation; area of general special education	Graduated student	Comments/explanations; rating scale	Preservice	2	.30
210. **Evaluation of Institute of Behavioral Research Cognitive Examination** University of the District of Columbia Washington, D.C.	Questionnaire; adequacy of a program examination	Student	Multiple choice	Preservice	1	.25

Instrument Number Name & Origin	Description of Instrument	The Respondent(s)	Item Format	Program Type	# of Pages	The Cost
211. **Student Evaluation** University of the District of Columbia Washington, D.C.	Questionnaire; general characteristics of a practicum student	Supervising teacher	Comments/explanations; rating scale	Preservice	6	.50
212. **Practicum Suitability Form** University of the District of Columbia Washington, D.C.	Questionnaire; general characteristics of the supervising teacher at the practicum site; general characteristics of the program's practicum	Student	Rating scale; short answer	Preservice	2	.30
213. **Practicum Placements** University of the District of Columbia Washington, D.C.	Questionnaire; resources of a program's practicum; area of severely multiply disabled	Student	Rating scale; short answer	Preservice	2	.30
214. **Training Proficiency Scale** University of the District of Columbia Washington, D.C.	Formal observation; skill/competency levels of a student	Not specified	Rating scale	Preservice; inservice	1	.25
215. **Mainstreaming Mildly Handicapped Children** University of Virginia Charlottesville, Virginia	Questionnaire; attitudes/perceptions toward mainstreaming	Teachers	Multiple choice; rating scale	Preservice; inservice; state department	5	.45
216. **1978 National Workshop Series Pre-Workshop Evaluation** Trace Research and Development Center University of Wisconsin Madison, Wisconsin	Objective test; skill/competency levels and knowledge of inservice participants; area of communicative disorders	Inservice participant	Essay; short answer; checklist; ranking	Inservice	5	.45

Instrument Number Name & Origin	Description of Instrument	The Respondent(s)	Item Format	Program Type	# of Pages	The Cost
217. **Review of Introductory Topics** Trace Research and Development Center University of Wisconsin Madison, Wisconsin	Objective test, students' knowledge of communication skills; area of communicative disorders	Student	Short answer	Preservice; inservice	2	.30
218. **Communication Development Workshop Evaluation** Trace Research and Development Center University of Wisconsin Madison, Wisconsin	Questionnaire; general characteristics of inservice training; area of communicative disorders	Inservice participant	Comments/explanations; rating scale; short answer; checklist	Inservice	3	.35
219. **Survey of Graduate Job Performance** Special Education Coppin State College Baltimore, Maryland	Informal observation; skill/competency levels of a program graduate; on-the-job situation; area of general special education	Employer	Comments/explanations; rating scale	Preservice	7	.55
220. **Competency Assessment Form** Special Education Coppin State College Baltimore, Maryland	Questionnaire; knowledge and skill/competency levels of classroom teachers; area of severely multiply disabled	Faculty member	Rating scale	Preservice; inservice	5	.45
221. **Site Supervisor Rating of Field Experience and Site Information** Special Education Coppin State College Baltimore, Maryland	Set of instruments; questionnaire form; general characteristics of a practicum student; general characteristics of the practicum site	Site supervisor	Comments/explanations; short answer	Preservice	7	.55
222. **Rating of University Field Experience Supervisor** Special Education Coppin State College Baltimore, Maryland	Set of instruments; formal observation; general characteristics of the supervising teacher at the practicum site; general characteristics of the practicum	Site supervisor	Comments/explanations; fill in the blank; rating scale; short answer	Preservice	3	.35

Instrument Number Name & Origin	Description of Instrument	The Respondent(s)	Item Format	Program Type	# of Pages	The Cost
223. **Student Teaching Competency Evaluation** Special Education Coppin State College Baltimore, Maryland	Formal observation general characteristics of a student in the practicum; area of general special education	Supervising teacher	Comments/explanations; fill in the blank; rating scale	Preservice	11	.75
224. **Rating of the Site Supervisor** Special Education Coppin State College Baltimore, Maryland	Questionnaire; general characteristics of a practicum site supervisor	Site supervisor	Comments/explanations; multiple choice; rating scale; checklist	Preservice	2	.30
225. **Faculty Course Questionnaire FCQ** Department of Communication Disorders and Speech Science University of Colorado Boulder, Colorado	Set of instruments; questionnaire form; attitudes/perceptions of course instructor and of the students toward the course	Faculty member; student	Comments/explanations; fill in the blank; rating scale	Preservice	Copyrighted material	Not available through ETC
226. **Student Evaluation of Instructor** Department of Communication Disorders and Speech Science University of Colorado Boulder, Colorado	Questionnaire; skill/competency levels of a course instructor	Student	Rating scale	Preservice	1	.25
227. **Instructor Evaluation of Students** Department of Communication Disorders and Speech Science University of Colorado Boulder, Colorado	Questionnaire; skill/competency levels of a practicum student	Faculty member	Rating scale	Preservice	2	.30
228. **Course Evaluations: Articulation Disorders** Department of Communication Disorders and Speech Science University of Colorado Boulder, Colorado	Questionnaire; knowledge levels of a student in the course; area of communicative disorders	Faculty member	Rating scale	Preservice	2	.30

Instrument Number Name & Origin	Description of Instrument	The Respondent(s)	Item Format	Program Type	# of Pages	The Cost
229. **Course Evaluations: Conservation of Hearing** Department of Communication Disorders and Speech Science University of Colorado Boulder, Colorado	Questionnaire; knowledge levels of a student; area of communicative disorders	Faculty member	Rating scale	Preservice	2	.30
230. **Course Evaluation: Clinical Remediation of LLD** Department of Communication Disorders and Speech Science University of Colorado Boulder, Colorado	Questionnaire; knowledge levels of a student; area of learning disabilities	Faculty member	Rating scale	Preservice	1	.25
231. **Course Evaluations: Cerebral Palsy** Department of Communication Disorders and Speech Science University of Colorado Boulder, Colorado	Questionnaire; knowledge levels of a student; area of cerebral palsy	Faculty member	Rating scale	Preservice	2	.30
232. **Course Evaluations: Speech and Language Development** Department of Communication Disorders and Speech Science University of Colorado Boulder, Colorado	Questionnaire; knowledge levels of a student in the course; area of communicative disorders	Faculty member	Rating scale	Preservice	1	.25
233. **Student Evaluation for Manual Communication** Department of Communication Disorder and Speech Science University of Colorado Boulder, Colorado	Questionnaire; skill/competency levels of a student in the course; area of communicative disorders	Faculty member	Rating scale	Preservice	1	.25

Instrument Number Name & Origin	Description of Instrument	The Respondent(s)	Item Format	Program Type	# of Pages	The Cost
234. **Course Evaluations: Phonetic Science** Department of Communication Disorders and Speech Science University of Colorado Boulder, Colorado	Questionnaire; knowledge levels of a student; area of communicative disorders	Faculty member	Rating scale	Preservice	1	.25
235. **Course Evaluations: Multi-Handicapped Communication Disordered Children** Department of Communication Disorders and Speech Science University of Colorado Boulder, Colorado	Questionnaire; course content in an academic program; areas of communicative disorders and severely multiply disabled	Student	Rating scale	Preservice	1	.25
236. **Course Evaluations: Language Bases of LD** Department of Communication Disorders and Speech Science University of Colorado Boulder, Colorado	Questionnaire; knowledge levels of a student; area of learning disabled	Faculty member	Rating scale	Preservice	2	.30
237. **Course Evaluations: Speech and Language Development of Deaf** Department of Communication Disorders and Speech Science University of Colorado Boulder, Colorado	Questionnaire; knowledge levels of a student; area of communicative disorders	Faculty member	Short answer	Preservice	1	.25
238. **Course Evaluations: Psycho-linguistics** Department of Communication Disorders and Speech Science University of Colorado Boulder, Colorado	Questionnaire; knowledge and skill/competency levels of a student; area of learning disabilities; psycho-linguistics	Faculty member	Rating scale	Preservice	1	.25

Instrument Number Name & Origin	Description of Instrument	The Respondent(s)	Item Format	Program Type	# of Pages	The Cost
239. **Course Evaluations: Theories of Language Development** Department of Communication Disorders and Speech Science University of Colorado Boulder, Colorado	Questionnaire; knowledge of a student; area of communicative disorders	Faculty member	Rating scale	Preservice	1	.25
240. **Course Evaluations: Assessment of Hearing** Department of Communication Disorders and Speech Science University of Colorado Boulder, Colorado	Questionnaire; knowledge levels of a student; area of communicative disorders	Faculty member	Rating scale	Preservice; inservice	1	.25
241. **Course Evaluations: Cleft Palate** Department of Communication Disorders and Speech Science University of Colorado Boulder, Colorado	Questionnaire; knowledge levels of a student; area of communicative disorders	Faculty member	Rating scale	Preservice	1	.25
242. **Student Reactionnaire** Teachers College Columbia University New York, New York	Questionnaire; skill/competency levels and attitudes/perceptions of students in the context of a course; area of general special education	Student	Fill in the blank; rating scale	Preservice	10	.70
243. **Graduate Questionnaire** Teachers College Columbia University New York, New York	Questionnaire; demographic information of a program graduate; on-the-job situation; the needs of the program; area of general special education	Graduated student	Comments/explanations; fill in the blank; checklist	Preservice	4	.40

Instrument Number Name & Origin	Description of Instrument	The Respondent(s)	Item Format	Program Type	# of Pages	The Cost
244. **Pre-Post Assessment (Knowledge of Educating the Handicapped in Regular Education)** College of Education Arkansas State University State University, Arkansas	Objective test; knowledge levels of a student; area of general special education	Student	Multiple choice	Preservice; inservice	4	.40
245. **Graduate Student Information Survey** Virginia Polytechnical Institute and State University Blacksburg, Virginia	Questionnaire; demographic information of program graduates; on-the-job situation; area of general special education	Graduated student	Comments/explanations; rating scale; checklist	Preservice	11	.75
246. **Theraputic Evaluation and Treatment Center Skills Assessment** Southeast Mental Health and Retardation Center Fargo, North Dakota	Set of instruments; formal observation; skill/competency levels of preschoolers in development of language, cognitive, personal, social, fine, and gross motor skills	Teacher; therapist	Fill in the blank; multiple choice; checklist	Preservice; inservice; preschool program	75	3.95
247. **Minn-Kota's Consortium Training Level 4 Pre-Post Test** Southeast Mental Health and Retardation Center Fargo, North Dakota	Objective test; knowledge levels of a student; area of general special education	Student	Fill in the blank; multiple choice; short answer	Preservice	7	.55
248. **Theraputic Competency Checklist and An Item Analysis for Ratings on a Five Point Scale** Southeast Mental Health and Retardation Center Fargo, North Dakota	Informal observation; skill/competency levels of an inservice participant in a workshop	Inservice participant	Checklist	Preservice	36	2.00
249. **Evaluation of the Teaming Model** Virginia Commonwealth University Richmond, Virginia	Set of instruments; general characteristics of professional support services for work teams composed of faculty and graduate assistants	Multiple persons	Verbal essay; rating scale	Preservice	34	1.90

Instrument Number Name & Origin	Description of Instrument	The Respondent(s)	Item Format	Program Type	# of Pages	The Cost
250. **Questionnaire: Directory of Available Special Education Resources** Virginia Commonwealth University Richmond, Virginia	Questionnaire; resources available for inservice training	Not specified	Comments/explanations; essay; rating scale; checklist	Preservice	1	.25
251. **Survey of Student Teachers in the Department of Elementary Education** Virginia Commonwealth University Richmond, Virginia	Questionnaire; attitudes/perceptions of students in the practicum; outcomes of the program courses	Student	Multiple choice; checklist	Preservice; inservice	2	.30
252. **Student Practicum Performance Report** State University of New York Buffalo, New York	Questionnaire; skill/competency levels of a practicum student; area of communicative disorders	Site supervisor	Comments/explanations; rating scale	Preservice	9	.65
253. **Student Evaluation Form Supervised Clinical Externships** State University of New York Buffalo, New York	Questionnaire; general characteristics of students in the practicum; area of communicative disorders	Student	Short answer	Preservice	5	.45
254. **Student's Evaluation of Supervision** State University of New York Buffalo, New York	Questionnaire; general characteristics of a supervising teacher; in the practicum; area of communicative disorders	Student	Comments/explanations; fill in the blank	Preservice	1	.25
255. **Supervisor's Checklist** State University of New York Buffalo, New York	Analysis of worksample; general characteristics of a practicum student; area of communicative disorders	Supervising teacher	Comments/explanations;	Preservice	1	.25

Instrument Number Name & Origin	Description of Instrument	The Respondent(s)	Item Format	Program Type	# of Pages	The Cost
256. **Supervisor Evaluation** State University of New York Buffalo, New York	Questionnaire; general characteristics of a supervising teacher; area of communicative disorders	Student	Rating scale	Preservice; inservice	5	.45
257. **Clinical Performance Review** State University of New York Buffalo, New York	Cumulative record; skill/competency levels of a student in the practicum; area of communicative disorders	Faculty member	Comments/explanations; rating scale	Preservice	1	.25
258. **Summary Sheet: Graduate Level Practicum Experience and Clinical Performance** State University of New York Buffalo, New York	Cumulative record; qualifications of a practicum student; area of communicative disorders	Not specified	Fill in the blank	Preservice	1	.25
259. **Clinical Performance Evaluation Form** State University of New York Buffalo, New York	Formal observation; skill/competency levels of a practicum student; area of communicative disorders	Site supervisor	Rating scale	Preservice	11	.75
260. **Rehabilitation Counseling Skills Inventory Manual** Counseling and Personnel Department Kent State University Kent, Ohio	Questionnaire; skill/competency levels of a practicum student; area of general special education	Site supervisor	Rating scale	Preservice	13	.85
261. **Nutrition Education Program** Region 20 San Antonio, Texas	Questionnaire; general characteristics of nutrition education program	Program administrator	Comments/explanations; fill in the blank; rating scale	Inservice	3	.35
262. **ESC-20 Curriculum Infusion Guide Checklist** Region 20 San Antonio, Texas	Questionnaire; outcomes of a program course; area of crime prevention and drug education	Faculty member	Rating scale	Preservice; inservice	2	.30
263. **Teacher Implementation Checklist Metric Education** Region 20 San Antonio, Texas	Questionnaire; general characteristics of inservice training	Faculty member	Multiple choice; short answer; checklist	Inservice	2	.30

Instrument Number Name & Origin	Description of Instrument	The Respondent(s)	Item Format	Program Type	# of Pages	The Cost
264. **ESC-20 Workshop Evaluation Form** Region 20 San Antonio, Texas	Questionnaire; general characteristics of inservice training	Inservice participant	Comments/explanations; multiple choice; checklist	Inservice	2	.30
265. **Technical Assistance Rating Form** Region 20 San Antonio, Texas	Questionnaire; the actual processes of professional support services	Not specified	Comments/explanations; rating scale	Preservice; inservice	2	.30
266. **Graduate Survey Questionnaire** Special Education West Virginia University Morgantown, West Virginia	Questionnaire; demographic information of program graduates; on-the-job situation; instructional goals of the program design; area of general special education	Graduated student	Comments/explanations; multiple choice; rating scale; short answer	Preservice	10	.70
267. **Graduate Employer Survey** Special Education West Virginia University Morgantown, West Virginia	Questionnaire; skill/competency levels of program graduates; on-the-job situation; area of general special education	Employer	Rating scale	Preservice; inservice	4	.40
268. **Student Exit Survey** Special Education West Virginia University Morgantown, West Virginia	Questionnaire; general characteristics of a program design; area of general special education	Student	Multiple choice; short answer	Preservice	7	.55
269. **Practicum Evaluation** Special Education West Virginia University Morgantown, West Virginia	Set of instruments; questionnaire form; general characteristics of multiple persons at the practicum site, and general characteristics of the program practicum	Student; supervising teacher	Comments/explanations; short answer; checklist	Preservice	6	.50
270. **Undergraduate Certification Survey** Special Education West Virginia University Morgantown, West Virginia	Questionnaire; demographic information of program graduates; on-the-job situation; area of general special education	Graduated student	Checklist	Preservice; inservice	2	.30

Instrument Number Name & Origin	Description of Instrument	The Respondent(s)	Item Format	Program Type	# of Pages	The Cost
271. **Student Entry Survey** Special Education West Virginia University Morgantown, West Virginia	Questionnaire; qualifications of preadmission students; area of general special education	Student	Fill in the blank; multiple choice	Preservice	5	.45
272. **Workshop—Severe/Profound Evaluation Form** State Board of Education State of Illinois Springfield, Illinois	Questionnaire; general characteristics of an inservice workshop; area of severely multiply disabled	Inservice participant	Comments/explanations; short answers; ranking	Inservice	2	.30
273. **Interview/Checklist and Schedule for Directors** State Board of Education State of Illinois Springfield, Illinois	Interview form; general characteristics of inservice training; area of general special education	Not specified	Short answer	Inservice	4	.40
274. **Interview/Checklist Schedule for Staff Personnel** State Board of Education State of Illinois Springfield, Illinois	Interview; general characteristics of inservice training; area of general special education	Not specified	Comments/explanations; short answer	Inservice; state department	3	.35
275. **Illinois Teachers of the Hearing Impaired Annual Workshop Evaluation Questionnaire** State Board of Education State of Illinois Springfield, Illinois	Questionnaire; general characteristics of inservice training; area of communicative disorders	Inservice participant	Fill in the blank; rating scale; short answer; checklist	Inservice	3	.35
276. **Gifted Program Evaluation Report and Form** State Board of Education State of Illinois Springfield, Illinois	Questionnaire; processes of programs; area of the gifted	Not specified	Fill in the blank	State department	3	.35

Instrument Number Name & Origin	Description of Instrument	The Respondent(s)	Item Format	Program Type	# of Pages	The Cost
277. **ASC for Gifted Semi-Annual Self-Evaluation Report** State Board of Education State of Illinois Springfield, Illinois	Questionnaire; general characteristics of a service center; area of the gifted	Inservice staff member	Fill in the blank; short answer; checklist	Inservice	7	.55
278. **Annual Self-Assessment Questionnaire** State Board of Education State of Illinois Springfield, Illinois	Evaluation system; cumulative record; actual processes of direct services; area of general special education	Consultant/observer	Comments/explanations; fill in the blank; checklist	State department	19	1.15
279. **Images--Interim Manual for Assorting Guaranteed Educational Services** State Board of Education State of Illinois Springfield, Illinois	Rules of the State Board of Education in Illinois regarding compliance with requirements of PL 94-142 and other laws and regulations guaranteeing educational services			State department; local school district	Copyrighted material	Not available through ETC
280. **Mt. Plains Regional Center Technical Accountability Team Review (A & B)** Mt. Plains Regional Center for Services to Handicapped Children Denver, Colorado	Evaluation system; various modes of measurement; actual processes of program placement; area of communicative disorders	Program administrator	Comments/explanations; fill in the blank; rating scale	State department	52	2.80
281. **4th Year Manpower Project Workscope** Special Education Manpower Project Massachusetts Department of Education Boston, Massachusetts	Description of project workscope in terms of objectives, processes, and products			Preservice; inservice; state department	7	.55

Instrument Number Name & Origin	Description of Instrument	The Respondent(s)	Item Format	Program Type	# of Pages	The Cost
282. **Interstate Steering Committee Questionnaire** Special Education Manpower Project Massachusetts Department of Education Boston, Massachusetts	Questionnaire; outcomes of an interstate steering committee; area of general special education	Not specified	Rating scale	State department	3	.35
283. **Data Matrix 3rd Year** Special Education Manpower Project Massachusetts Department of Education Boston, Massachusetts	Cumulative record; current and projected supply of special education personnel			Preservice; inservice; state department	5	.45
284. **Committee Member Questionnaire** Special Education Manpower Project Massachusetts Department of Education Boston, Massachusetts	Questionnaire; general characteristics of a committee's operations; area of general special education	Committee member	Comments/explanations; fill in the blank; short answer; checklist	State department	5	.45
285. **Evaluation Plan 78-79** Special Education Manpower Project Massachusetts Department of Education Boston, Massachusetts	Evaluation plan and program design			Preservice; inservice; state department	8	.60
286. **Information Questionnaire (Grads)** Speech Pathology & Audiology Ball State University Muncie, Indiana	Questionnaire; general characteristics of a program graduate; on-the-job situation; area of communicative disorders	Graduated student	Multiple items	Preservice	9	.65

Instrument Number Name & Origin	Description of Instrument	The Respondent(s)	Item Format	Program Type	# of Pages	The Cost
287. **Evaluation of Performance Supervisor/Employer** Speech Pathology & Audiology Ball State University Muncie, Indiana	Questionnaire; skill/competency levels of a program graduate; on-the-job situation; area of communicative disorders	Employer	Rating scale	Preservice	2	.30
288. **Evaluation of Student Teachers** Speech Pathology & Audiology Ball State University Muncie, Indiana	Formal observation; general characteristics of a student in the practicum; area of communicative disorders	Supervising teacher	Comments/explanations; rating scale; short answer	Preservice	3	.35
289. **Student's Evaluation of Student Teaching Experience** Speech Pathology & Audiology Ball State University Muncie, Indiana	Questionnaire; process and outcomes of a program practicum; area of communicative disorders	Student	Rating scale; short answer	Preservice	3	.35
290. **Clinician Evaluation Form** Speech Pathology & Audiology Ball State University Muncie, Indiana	Questionnaire; skill/competency levels of a practicum student; area of communicative disorders	Site supervisor	Rating scale	Preservice	2	.30
291. **Instruction Sheet Competency Forms** Speech Pathology & Audiology Ball State University Muncie, Indiana	Set of instruments; informal observations; skill/competency levels of a student; area of communicative disorders	Student	Rating scale	Preservice; inservice	29	1.65
292. **Peer Evaluation** Speech Pathology & Audiology Ball State University Muncie, Indiana	Informal observation; performance of course instructors; on-the-job situation	Observer	Comments/explanations; rating scale	Preservice	2	.30

Instrument Number Name & Origin	Description of Instrument	The Respondent(s)	Item Format	Program Type	# of Pages	The Cost
293. **Clinician Evaluation of Supervision** Speech Pathology & Audiology Ball State University Muncie, Indiana	Questionnaire; general characteristics of the supervising teacher; at the practicum site; general characteristics of the practicum	Student	Rating scale; ranking	Preservice	3	.35
294. **Currie-Milonas Screening Test (for Learning Disabilities)** Gordon College Wenham, Massachusetts	Screening test to measure achievement in reading, spelling, writing, and mathematics in grades 6-10	Teacher/examiner		Local school disctricts	Copyrighted material	Not available through ETC
295. **Evaluation of Staff Development Activities** Grant Wood Area Education Agency Cedar Rapids, Iowa	Questionnaire; general characteristics of inservice training	Inservice participant	Fill in the blank; multiple choice; rating scale	Inservice	4	.40
296. **Special Education Inservice Evaluation** Grant Wood Area Education Agency Cedar Rapids, Iowa	Questionnaire, general characteristics of inservice training; area of general special education	Inservice participant	Rating scale	Inservice	2	.30
297. **Program Design/Evaluation Questionnaire** Department of Family Medicine University of Connecticut Health Center Storrs, Connecticut	Questionnaire and description of program activities for training of citizen boards in the mental health field	Program administrator	Comments/explanations; essay; short answer	Human service agency	8	.60
298. **Perceptions of Developmental Skills (PODS)** HICOMP Outreach Project Pennsylvania State University University Park, Pennsylvania	Formal observation; skill/competency levels of preschoolers in development of communication; own care, motor, and problem solving skills	Teacher; parent	Comments/explanations; rating scale	Preservice; inservice; preschool programs	Copyrighted material	Not available through ETC

Instrument Number Name & Origin	Description of Instrument	The Respondent(s)	Item Format	Program Type	# of Pages	The Cost
299. **COMP--Ident Assessment Format** HICOMP Outreach Project Pennsylvania State University University Park, Pennsylvania	Manual describing an approach to screening, assessing, and designing programs for handicapped preschool children			Preservice; inservice; preschool programs	Copyrighted material	Not available through ETC
300. **COMP—Ident Find/Screen Planning Package** HICOMP Outreach Project Pennsylvania State University University Park, Pennsylvania	Guide for planning and conducting a program to identify handicapped preschool children			Preservice; inservice; preschool programs	Copyrighted material	Not available through ETC
301. **Personnel Training Needs** Houston Independent School District Houston, Texas	Questionnaire; needs within inservice training; area of general special education	Not specified	Checklist	Inservice	1	.25
302. **Inservice Needs Assessment—Elementary & Secondary Principals** Houston Independent School District Houston, Texas	Questionnaire; need for inservice training, area of general special education	School principals	Rating scale; short answer	Inservice	1	.25
303. **Inservice Needs Assessment (7 Forms)** Houston Independent School District Houston, Texas	Questionnaire; general characteristics of a needs assessment; area of general special education	Inservice participant	Rating scale; short answer	Inservice	6	.50
304. **Survey to Parents** Houston Independent School District Houston, Texas	Questionnaire; general characteristics of IEP meetings; area of general special education	Parent	Comments/explanations; rating scale	Inservice; local district	4	.40

Instrument Number Name & Origin	Description of Instrument	The Respondent(s)	Item Format	Program Type	# of Pages	The Cost
305. **Curriculum Materials Evaluation** Houston Independent School District Houston, Texas	Questionnaire; curriculum resource useability; area of general special education	Faculty member	Comments/explanations; fill in the blank; rating scale; matched answers	Local district	3	.35
306. **Internal Program Evaluation of Student Competencies (Entry & Exit Levels)** Vocational Education Florida International University Miami, Florida	Questionnaire; skill/competency levels of a student; in the practicum situation	Multiple persons	Rating scale	Preservice; inservice	47	2.55
307. **Lexington Developmental Scales (Long Form)** United Cerebral Palsy of the Bluegrass Lexington, Kentucky	Formal observation; skill/competency levels of preschoolers in development of motor, cognitive, language, personal and social skills	Teacher	Fill in the blank; multiple choice; rating scale	Preservice; inservice; preschool programs	Copyrighted material	Not available through ETC
308. **Lexington Developmental Scales (Short Form)** United Cerebral Palsy of the Bluegrass Lexington, Kentucky	Formal observation; skill/competency levels of preschoolers in development of motor, cognitive, language, personal and social skills	Teacher	Fill in the blank; rating scale	Preservice; inservice; preschool programs	Copyrighted material	Not available through ETC
309. **Innovative Inexpensive Instructional Materials** United Cerebral Palsy of the Bluegrass Lexington, Kentucky	Materials for teaching gross and fine motor, cognitive, language and other skills			Preschool programs	Copyrighted material	Not available through ETC
310. **Questionnaire for Parents** Mecklenburg County Public Schools Boydton, Virginia	Questionnaire; parent knowledge of child assessment services	Parent	Fill in the blank; rating scale; checklist	Local district	1	.25

Instrument Number Name & Origin	Description of Instrument	The Respondent(s)	Item Format	Program Type	# of Pages	The Cost
311. **Questionnaire for Teachers** Mecklenburg County Public Schools Boydton, Virginia	Questionnaire; instructional goals of a program design	Classroom teachers	Comments/explanations; rating scale	Preservice; inservice; state department; local district	3	.35
312. **Questionnaire for Administrators** Mecklenburg County Public Schools Boydton, Virginia	Questionnaire; instructional goals of a program design	Program administrator	Rating scale	Local district	4	.40
313. **Special Study Institute Opinionnaire** Department of Education State of Florida Tallahassee, Florida	Questionnaire; needs of inservice training; area of severely multiply disabled	Inservice participant	Multiple choice; rating scale; short answer	Inservice	3	.35
314. **Program Experience Questionnaire** Southwest Educational Development Laboratory Austin, Texas	Questionnaire; actual processes of inservice training	Inservice participant	Rating scale	Inservice	2	.30
315. **Survey of Graduate's Perception of Special Education Training** Department of Special Education Valdosta State College Valdosta, Georgia	Questionnaire; demographic information on program graduates; general characteristics of a preservice program; area of general special education	Graduated student	Fill in the blank; rating scale; checklist; ranking	Preservice	9	.65
316. **Survey of Supervisor's Perceptions of Special Education Training** Department of Special Education Valdosta State College Valdosta, Georgia	Questionnaire; skill/competency levels of program graduates; on-the-job situation	Employer	Comments/explanations; fill in the blank; rating scale; short answer	Preservice	5	.45

Instrument Number Name & Origin	Description of Instrument	The Respondent(s)	Item Format	Program Type	# of Pages	The Cost
317. **Satisfaction/Satisfactoriness Questionnaire** Department of Psychology Illinois Institute of Technology Chicago, Illinois	Evaluation system; questionnaire form; general characteristics of a program graduate; on-the-job situation; general characteristics of the preservice program; area of rehabilitation counseling	Graduated student	Multiple items	Preservice	25	1.45
318. **Evaluation of Staff Development Presentation** Inservice Training Program California State University Los Angeles, California	Questionnaire; actual processes of inservice training	Inservice participant	Comments/explanations; rating scale; short answer	Inservice	1	.25
319. **Criteria for Weekly Evaluation of Special Education Internship** North Kitsap School District Poulsbo, Washington	Evaluation system; formal observation form; skill/competency levels of a practicum student	Supervising teacher	Rating scale	Preservice	7	.55
320. **Evaluation of Supervision** Department of Speech Communication Portland State University Portland, Oregon	Questionnaire; skill/competency levels of supervising teachers; at the practicum site; area of communicative disorders	Not specified	Comments/explanations; rating scale	Preservice	2	.30
321. **Supervisor Rating of SE Teacher's Performance and Contributions** Department of Special Education University of Hawaii Honolulu, Hawaii	Questionnaire; skill/competency levels of a program graduate on-the-job situation; area of general special education	School principal	Comments/explanations; rating scale; checklist	Preservice	9	.65
322. **Impact on Services to SE Children** Department of Special Education University of Hawaii Honolulu, Hawaii	Questionnaire; processes within the the job situation; area of general special education	Graduated student	Fill in the blank; short answer	Preservice	5	.45

Instrument Number Name & Origin	Description of Instrument	The Respondent(s)	Item Format	Program Type	# of Pages	The Cost
323. **Graduate Follow-up Questionnaire** Department of Special Education University of Hawaii Honolulu, Hawaii	Questionnaire; process and outcomes of preservice training; area of general special education	Graduated student	Comments/explanations; fill in the blank; rating scale; checklist	Preservice	13	.85
324. **SED 556 Midterm Exam** Winthrop College Rock Hill, South Carolina	Objective test; student knowledge within the context of a course; area of general special education	Student	Multiple choice	Preservice	7	.55
325. **SED 556 Final Exam** Winthrop College Rock Hill, South Carolina	Objective test; student knowledge within the context of a course; area of general special education	Student	Multiple choice	Preservice	4	.40
326. **Evaluation of Interdisciplinary Lab Experience** Winthrop College Rock Hill, South Carolina	Questionnaire; general characteristics of a practicum student	Supervising teacher	Comments/explanations; rating scale	Preservice	2	.30
327. **Evaluation of Inservice Project** Winthrop College Rock Hill, South Carolina	Questionnaire; process of inservice training	Inservice participant	Comments/explanations; rating scale	Inservice	2	.30
328. **Winthrop College Course Evaluation** Winthrop College Rock Hill, South Carolina	Questionnaire; perceived attitudes/ perceptions of a course instructor; processes of the program courses	Student	Rating scale	Preservice	1	.25
329. **Follow-Along Questionnaire** Winthrop College Rock Hill, South Carolina	Cumulative recording form; changes/ progress made by a client	Not specified	Checklist	Preservice	2	.30
330. **Parent's Evaluation of Tutoring Program** Winthrop College Rock Hill, South Carolina	Questionnaire; perceived attitudes/ perceptions of a parent; parent training program	Parent	Comments/explanations; rating scale	Inservice	1	.25

Instrument Number Name & Origin	Description of Instrument	The Respondent(s)	Item Format	Program Type	# of Pages	The Cost
331. **UAF Special Training Report Form** Winthrop College Rock Hill, South Carolina	Questionnaire; processes of inservice training	Not specified	Fill in the blank	Inservice	1	.25
332. **UAF Trainee Registration Form** Winthrop College Rock Hill, South Carolina	Registration form; time spent in various activities; actual processes of the practicum; area of general special education	Student	Comments/explanations; fill in the blank; checklist	Preservice	1	.25
333. **Interdisciplinary Knowledge Test** Winthrop College Rock Hill, South Carolina	Objective test; student knowledge within the context of a course; area of developmental disabilities	Student	Multiple choice	Preservice	3	.35
334. **Special Education Knowledge Test** Winthrop College Rock Hill, South Carolina	Objective test; student knowledge within the context of a course; area of general special education	Student	Multiple choice	Preservice	2	.30
335. **Trainee Evaluation Form** Winthrop College Rock Hill, South Carolina	Questionnaire; general characteristics of a practicum student	Supervising teacher	Comments/explanations; rating scale	Preservice	2	.30
336. **Training Evaluation Form** Winthrop College Rock Hill, South Carolina	Questionnaire; actual processes of a program practicum	Student	Comments/explanations; rating scale	Preservice	2	.30
337. **Mainstreaming Survey** Department of Recreation and Park Administration University of Missouri Columbia, Missouri	Questionnaire; attitudes toward mainstreaming; needs of inservice training	Potential Inservice Participant	Rating scale; checklist	Inservice	3	.35

Instrument Number Name & Origin	Description of Instrument	The Respondent(s)	Item Format	Program Type	# of Pages	The Cost
338. **Faculty Advisor's Evaluation** School of Education University of South Dakota Vermillion, South Dakota	Questionnaire; general performance of the faculty practicum advisor; area of general special education	Site supervisor	Comments/explanations; rating scale	Preservice	7	.55
339. **Internship Questionnaire** School of Education University of South Dakota Vermillion, South Dakota	Questionnaire; general characteristics of the practicum, site supervisor and faculty advisor	Student	Rating scale	Preservice	8	.60
340. **Graduate Program Evaluation** School of Education University of South Dakota Vermillion, South Dakota	Questionnaire; general characteristics of a program; area of general special education	Student	Rating scale	Preservice	8	.60
341. **Workshop Evaluation** School of Education University of South Dakota Vermillion, South Dakota	Questionnaire; processes/outcomes of inservice training	Inservice participant	Comments/explanations; rating scale; checklist	Inservice	6	.50
342. **NCCU Faculty Evaluation System Forms** Research, Evaluation & Planning North Carolina Central University Durham, North Carolina	Evaluation system; knowledge and skill/competency levels of course instructors	Multiple persons	Comments/explanations; fill in the blank; rating scale; ranking	Preservice	43	2.35
343. **Follow-up Questionnaire Teacher Training Program in Severe and Profound Handicapping Conditions** Education Division Johns Hopkins University Baltimore, Maryland	Questionnaire; demographic information on program graduates; on-the-job situation; area of multiply handicapped	Graduated student	Comments/explanations; fill in the blank; rating scale; ranking	Preservice	20	1.20

Instrument Number Name & Origin	Description of Instrument	The Respondent(s)	Item Format	Program Type	# of Pages	The Cost
344. **Summative Evaluation of Inservice Training Workshop** Handicapped Preschool Education Program University of Wyoming Laramie, Wyoming	Formal observation; changes/ progress of an inservice workshop participant	Not specified	Comments/explanations; short answers	Inservice	2	.30
345. **Evaluation of the LD, MR, and ED Programs** Program in Special Education and Rehabilitation University of Maine Farmington, Maine	Questionnaire; general characteristics of a student in the context of a course; outcomes of a course; area of general special education	Student	Rating scale	Preservice	9	.65
346. **Student Teaching Experience** Program in Special Education and Rehabilitation University of Maine Farmington, Maine	Questionnaire; skill/competency levels and attitudes/perceptions of a practicum student; processes of the practicum	Student	Comments/explanations; rating scale	Preservice	3	.35
347. **Supervising Teacher Rating of Student Teacher** Program in Special Education and Rehabilitation University of Maine Farmington, Maine	Questionnaire; qualifications and skill/competency levels of a student in the practicum	Supervising teacher	Rating scale	Preservice	2	.30
348. **University Supervisor Rating of Student Teacher** Program in Special Education and Rehabilitation University of Maine Farmington, Maine	Questionnaire; qualifications and skill/competency levels of a practicum student; area of general special education	Supervising teacher	Rating scale; checklist	Preservice	2	.30
349. **Workshop Evaluation** Department of Health & Welfare State of Idaho Boise, Idaho	Questionnaire; general characteristics of inservice training	Inservice participant	Rating scale	Inservice	1	.25

Instrument Number Name & Origin	Description of Instrument	The Respondent(s)	Item Format	Program Type	# of Pages	The Cost
350. **Final Training Evaluation** Department of Health & Welfare State of Idaho Boise, Idaho	Questionnaire; skill/competency levels of inservice trainers; at a workshop; general characteristics of inservice training	Inservice participant	Comments/explanations; multiple choice; rating scale	Inservice	6	.50
351. **Evaluation Design** Oklahoma State Department of Education Oklahoma City, Oklahoma	Evaluation design for state department programs			Preservice; inservice; state department	11	.75
352. **Evaluation Forms** Oklahoma State Department of Education Oklahoma City, Oklahoma	Set of instruments; informal observations; general characteristics of persons involved in inservice training; processes of inservice training; area of general special education	Multiple persons	Multiple items	Inservice	6	.50
353. **Competency Log-Field Experiences with Exceptional Children - Generic** Division of Special Education University of San Diego San Diego, California	Cumulative record; skill/competency levels of a practicum student; area of general special education	Supervising teacher	Checklist	Preservice	14	.90
354. **Field Experiences with Exceptional Children—Advanced Specialization** Division of Special Education University of San Diego San Diego, California	Cumulative record; skill/competency levels of a practicum student; area of general special education	Supervising teacher	Fill in the blank	Preservice	8	.60
355. **Competency Log—Student Teacher Handbook** Division of Special Education University of San Diego San Diego, California	Cumulative record; skill/competency levels of a practicum student; area of general special education	Supervising teacher; student	Comments/explanations; fill in the blank; short answer	Preservice	13	.85

Instrument Number Name & Origin	Description of Instrument	The Respondent(s)	Item Format	Program Type	# of Pages	The Cost
356. **Follow-up Evaluation on Graduates** Division of Special Education University of San Diego San Diego, California	Questionnaire; skill/competency levels and attitudes/perceptions of a program graduate; on-the-job situation; area of general special education	Graduated student	Comments/explanations; rating scale	Preservice	3	.35
357. **Teacher Evaluation Questionnaire** Division of Special Education University of San Diego San Diego, California	Questionnaire; skill/competency levels of a program graduate; on-the-job situation; area of general special education	Employer	Comments/explanations; rating scale	Preservice	1	.25
358. **Student Evaluation of Course** Alabama Agricultural and Mechanical University Normal, Alabama	Questionnaire; students' interest and satisfaction with a program course	Student	Rating scale	Preservice	1	.25
359. **Adequacy Checklist** Alabama Agricultural and Mechanical University Normal, Alabama	Worksample analysis; IEP process; area of general special education	Rater	Checklist	Local district	1	.25
360. **Competency Assessment** Alabama Agricultural and Mechanical University Normal, Alabama	Questionnaire; knowledge and skill/competency levels of a program staff member; area of general special education	Not specified	Rating scale	Inservice	5	.45
361. **Competency Evaluation** Alabama Agricultural and Mechanical University Normal, Alabama	Questionnaire; skill/competency levels of a program graduate; on-the-job situation	Supervising teacher	Comments/explanations; rating scale	Preservice	2	.30
362. **Consultant Rating Scale—P** Alabama Agricultural and Mechanical University Normal, Alabama	Questionnaire; performance of teachers; on-the-job situation; area of learning disabilities	Not specified	Rating scale	Local district	1	.25

Instrument Number Name & Origin	Description of Instrument	The Respondent(s)	Item Format	Program Type	# of Pages	The Cost
363. Consultant Rating Scale—T Alabama Agricultural and Mechanical University Normal, Alabama	Questionnaire; performance of program staff members; area of learning disabilities	Recipient of services	Rating scale	Inservice	1	.25
364. Graduate School Evaluation Form Alabama Agricultural and Mechanical University Normal, Alabama	Questionnaire; general characteristics of a course instructor; processes of the course	Student	Rating scale	Preservice	4	.40
365. On Task Measure Alabama Agricultural and Mechanical University Normal, Alabama	Formal observation; form for recording "on task" behavior in 10 second intervals	Trained observer	Fill in the blank; checklist	Inservice	1	.25
366. Report of University Supervisor Alabama Agricultural and Mechanical University Normal, Alabama	Informal observation, general characteristics of a practicum student	Supervising teacher	Comments/explanations; rating scale	Preservice	1	.25
367. Intern Rating Scale Special Needs Program Wheelock College Boston, Massachusetts	Formal observation; general characteristics of a student in the practicum; area of general special education	Supervising teacher	Comments/explanations; rating scale	Preservice	47	2.55
368. Matrix of Growth Special Needs Program Wheelock College Boston, Massachusetts	Description of competency areas; enabling activities and performance evaluation criteria in graduate programs			Preservice; inservice	10	.70
369. Exploratory Day Contracts Special Needs Program Wheelock College Boston, Massachusetts	Schedule; activities log of students in the practicum	Student	Short answer	Preservice	3	.35

Instrument Number Name & Origin	Description of Instrument	The Respondent(s)	Item Format	Program Type	# of Pages	The Cost
370. **End of Year Program Review** Special Needs Program Wheelock College Boston, Massachusetts	Questionnaire; outcomes of a practicum	Student	Comments/explanations; rating scale	Preservice	12	.80
371. **Intern Orientation File** Special Needs Program Wheelock College Boston, Massachusetts	Cumulative record; general characteristics of a program practicum	Student	Comments/explanations; fill in the blank; short answer	Preservice	4	.40
372. **Employment Status Questionnaire** Special Needs Program Wheelock College Boston, Massachusetts	Questionnaire; demographic information of a program graduate; on-the-job situation; area of general special education	Graduated student	Comments/explanations; fill in the blank; checklist	Preservice	2	.30
373. **Follow-up Survey of Recent Grads** Special Needs Program Wheelock College Boston, Massachusetts	Questionnaire; skill/competency levels of a program graduate; on-the-job situation; general characteristics of a program's courses; area of general special education	Graduated student	Comments/explanations; rating scale; checklist	Preservice	6	.50
374. **Long-Term Grad Follow-up Survey** Special Needs Program Wheelock College Boston, Massachusetts	Questionnaire; demographic information of program graduates; on-the-job situation; area of general special education	Graduated student	Comments/explanations; fill in the blank; checklist	Preservice	3	.35
375. **Interns' Projects and Site Needs Assessment** Special Needs Program Wheelock College Boston, Massachusetts	Questionnaire; needs of a program's practicum; area of general special education	Site supervisor	Comments/explanations; checklist; ranking	Preservice	2	.30
376. **Orientation Meeting Site Needs Assessment** Special Needs Program Wheelock College Boston, Massachusetts	Questionnaire; needed programs of inservice participants	Future inservice participant	Checklist	Preservice	1	.25

Instrument Number Name & Origin	Description of Instrument	The Respondent(s)	Item Format	Program Type	# of Pages	The Cost
377. **Weekly Time Record** Special Needs Program Wheelock College Boston, Massachusetts	Cumulative record; skill/competency levels of a practicum student	Student	Fill in the blank	Preservice	4	.40
378. **Parent Interview** Special Needs Program Wheelock College Boston, Massachusetts	Procedural outline interviewing parents of pre-school children with whom the graduate student works	Student	Essay	Preservice; preschool program	2	.30
379. **Parent Training Needs Survey** Parent Educational Advocacy Training Center Alexandria, Virginia	Questionnaire; needs of parents for assistance in developing skills for dealing with handicapped children	Parent	Rating scale	Inservice	4	.40
380. **Supervisor's Rating of Graduates** Department of Communicative Disorders University of North Dakota Grand Forks, North Dakota	Questionnaire; effectiveness of Master's program by assessment of skills of graduates	Supervisor	Rating scale; multiple choice; comments	Preservice	2	.30
381. **Graduate Follow-up** Department of Communicative Disorders University of North Dakota Grand Forks, North Dakota	Questionnaire; effectiveness of graduate program	Program graduate	Rating scale; multiple choice; comments; fill in the blank	Preservice	7	.55
382. **Mainstreaming Summer Institute** University of Virginia Charlottesville, Virginia	Questionnaire; effectiveness of workshop in meeting needs of participants	Inservice participant	Rating scale; comments	Inservice	4	.40
383. **Behavioral Developmental Profile** Department of Special Education Marshalltown, Iowa	Formal observation; standardized instrument to measure children's eligibility for special programs	Examiner	Checklist; comments	Preservice	Copyrighted material	Not available through ETC

Instrument Number Name & Origin	Description of Instrument	The Respondent(s)	Item Format	Program Type	# of Pages	The Cost
384. **National Rural Project** Center for Innovation and Development Murray State University Murray, Kentucky	Set of instruments; questionnaires; area of general special education in a rural setting	Multiple persons	Multiple items	State department; local school district	88	4.90
385. **Inservice Education Evaluation System** Aurarie Communicative Disorders Clinic Denver, Colorado	Set of instruments; questionnaires; general characteristics of inservice training; area of communicative disorders	Inservice participant; inservice staff member	Comments/explanations; rating scale; checklist	Inservice	12	.80
386. **Tufts/EdCo Inservice Training Program** Tufts University Medford, Massachusetts	Evaluation system; questionnaires; general characteristics of multiple persons on the job; general characteristics of inservice training	Multiple persons	Comments/explanations; fill in the blank; multiple choice; rating scale; ranking	Inservice	22	1.30
387. **Competency Attainment Record** Department of Special Education University of Hawaii Honolulu, Hawaii	Formal observation; skill/competency levels of a student in a course; area of general special education	Faculty member	Comments/explanations; rating scale	Preservice	12	.80
388. **Field Observation** Department of Special Education University of Hawaii Honolulu, Hawaii	Formal observation; general characteristics of a student in the practicum; area of general special education	Faculty member; student	Comments/explanations; fill in the blank; rating scale	Preservice	4	.40
389. **Feedback on Special Education 400 Students** Department of Special Education University of Hawaii Honolulu, Hawaii	Questionnaire; general characteristics of a student in the practicum; area of general special education	Supervising teacher	Comments/explanations; fill in the blank; rating scale; checklist	Preservice	5	.45

Appendix A

The Instrument Summary Critique includes a total of twenty-two criteria for assessing the quality of an instrument. These criteria are divided into four areas: introduction/cover letter, directions, items, and format. (see page *viii*)

What the critique tells you

For each criterion on which an instrument was rated, one of the following judgments was made:

–a "problem" which means:	the instrument does not appear to meet the criterion or it could be improved with respect to the criterion
–"not a problem" which means:	the instrument appears to meet the criterion
–"NA" which means:	the criterion does not apply to this instrument

In many cases examples of violations of the criteria are given, as well as suggestions for improving the instrument.

What the critique does not tell you

While these twenty-two criteria are generally applicable to many instruments, they are not the only factors which influence the quality of an instrument. Therefore, a list of "not a problem" checks on the critique form does not necessarily imply that the instrument is perfect in every way. A major criterion for a good instrument is that it collects appropriate information for the interpretations and uses which are to be made of it. This information, related to the validity of the instrument and the context in which it was or could be used was not available to us, and therefore, the critique of the instrument does not take these factors into account. Because we intend the instruments in this catalog to be used as examples for others who are developing their own instruments, we leave it to those developers to consider these and other important factors. The references for instrument development listed at the end of this appendix provide some quidelines for doing this work.

How the criteria were applied and what they mean

–Criteria addressing the introduction and cover letter

1. **Identification of the purposes and use of the instrument**
2. **Identifying why the respondent was selected**
3. **Assurance of confidentiality and anonymity of the respondent**
4. **Motivator(s) for completion and return of the instrument**
5. **Directions for returning the completed instrument**
6. **Identifying who is requesting the information**

When reviewing the instruments we kept in mind the fact that the respondent's first exposure to an instrument is usually through its cover letter or introduction. To increase the chances of the respondent completing and returning the instrument and of doing so as an informed participant in the evaluation effort, it is important that he or she be given information about the purposes of the instrument, who wants the information, how it will be used, etc. Thus, in reviewing the instrument we looked for these and other features listed in 1-6 above. Depending on the method of administration, we realize that this information may be given verbally; however, providing an accompanying well-written statement is often worth the extra effort.

In addition to the general introduction for the entire instrument, if there are content subsections, we looked for a brief statement of purpose and content at the beginning of those sections. This helps the respondent prepare for the items which follow, especially if there seems to be a sudden change in topic.

–Criteria addressing the directions

7. **Directions for completing the instrument**

Although many respondents are already familiar with procedures for completing instruments, we believe that it is important to give explicit directions to minimize confusion that can lead to inappropriate responses and later problems in summarizing and analyzing findings.

We thought that those directions should include two features. They should tell the respondent:

- what kind of answer is expected, e.g., "from the list below, check *all* . . .", "select the *one* response that *best* describes . . .", "*rank* the importance of . . ."
- how to indicate his or her answer, e.g., "place an X in the box next to . . .", "place a 1 next to the most important . . .", "briefly describe in the space below . . ."

In addition, some directions—depending on the kind of information they are intended to elicit—should include other features such as:

- the point of view from which the respondent should respond, e.g., "when answering the following questions, draw on your experiences as a . . ."

Thus, in reviewing instruments we considered the clarity and adequacy of the directions for guiding and motivating the respondent.

Some suggestions for improving directions are also indicated on some critiques, for example, underlining critical words to give emphasis and to make it easy for the respondent to refer to those key words as he or she completes the instrument.

8. Guidelines for comments

In many cases it is desirable to leave open space for respondents to make comments about the subjects addressed in the instrument or about the instrument itself. Such open space may also be included after a single item or a set of items. When such a space is simply labeled "comment," it serves as additional room for the respondent who wants to write more than has been accommodated elsewhere on the instrument. In many cases respondents will leave it blank.

To elicit specific kinds of comments, it is a good practice to provide some guidelines indicating the kinds of comments one could make, for example, "please comment on . . ." or "comment (e.g., . . .)"

When reviewing instruments we kept in mind these different purposes for comment sections and indicated cases in which it appeared that the instrument could be more effective in eliciting information by giving the respondent more explicit guidelines.

–Criteria addressing the items

9. Item stems relevant to the purpose of the instrument

A well-designed instrument should include only items that are consistent with its purpose. As additional irrelevant items are added, the instrument will lose coherence and logic from the point of view of the respondent and probably provide no additional useful information.

Without a statement of the purpose of the instrument, it was difficult for us to make judgments about the relevance of item stems (the part of the item to which the respondent responds). However, in many cases we could infer a general purpose from an introduction or instrument title and used that as a basis for judging relevance. Of course, users of these instruments should be aware that these were rough judgments. They must consider their own purposes for any instruments they design and use those purposes as criteria for borrowing pieces of instruments from this catalog.

10. Unidimensional stems usage

When critiquing the instruments we noted problems in items which addressed more than one variable.

For example, directives like the following may yield information that is difficult to interpret because each response is actually the combination of two responses:

> "Rate the extent to which you think the workshop was interesting
>
> and provided information useful to you in the classroom."

We rated items such as this "a problem" and offered alternatives for soliciting responses on both participant interest and perception of information utility.

11. Specified unit of response

This criterion means, essentially, that the item should indicate the kind of response that is expected. This requires careful wording, but the payoff is a reduction in respondent confusion and responses that are more readily interpreted.

For example, on a forced-choice item in which the respondent is asked to indicate how long he or she has used a particular set of instructional materials, the respondent who used the materials from September 1, 1980, to February 28, 1981, could answer in many different ways; e.g., "6 months," "½ year," "less than a year," "since September," or "more than a semester." All are cor-

rect responses, but some may be preferable for ease of aggregation and because of precision required for the analysis. Thus, if the question asked: "for how many months . . . ." or "in what month and year did you first use . . . .," the unit of response is given. Writing the unit on the line where the response is to be written is often a good reminder of the appropriate unit.

12. Exhaustive response categories

13. Nonoverlapping response categories

We indicated that an instrument had a "problem" when response categories did not include all possible responses and when the respondent was put in a position of having to choose between two response options that were both correct.

The following example violates both of these criteria:

"Please indicate your age:

25 years or younger 25 to 30 over 50."

Obviously, the person who is 25 has two categories from which to choose, and the person who is 31-50 has none.

A better set of options would be one that meets both criteria, for example:

younger than 25 25-to 29 30 to 39 40 to 49 50 or older

14. Response categories relevant to stems

15. Other response options provided when necessary (I don't know, not applicable, no opinion, etc.)

While criteria 11–13 emphasize the importance of well-worded response categories per se, these criteria note the necessity of ensuring that those categories are meaningful in relation to the item stems.

For example, consider an instrument that has a number of items regarding a university course; the stems are statements about the course and the response options are five points on a scale fro strongly agree to strongly disagree. Stems such as "There was an appropriate number of readings" and "There was adequate time for class discussion" can be responded to with any of the scaled response options. But a stem such as "How well was the instructor prepared?" doesn't match any of the response options.

Although this criterion may appear to be an easy one to meet, we found that it was often violated on instruments having items with a common set of response options. It seems that item writers can easily forget to match stems to responses when there's a long list of them. It may also be that in the interest of format consistency they try to force items into an in appropriate section.

One way to check on the relevance of response categories is to role play a respondent by reading the item stem and then selecting any of the response options to be sure they are sensible responses.

This is also a good way to check on the adequacy of those response options by making sure that "don't know," "not applicable," or other possible responses are included when necessary.

16. Use of language which may bias responses

It's possible to help shape a response by writing item stems that are "leading questions." For example, an item on a workshop rating form which encourages a positive response.

"Don't you agree that the materials will help you in the classroom?"

We felt that items like this posed a possible threat to obtaining unbiased information, and we provided suggestions on alternative ways of phrasing the stem.

17. Use of clear terminology

18. Use of correct grammar

Respondents will be able to provide more accurate information if the language on the instrument is kept clear and appropriate to the audience for which it is intended. When reviewing the instruments we had to keep the intended audience in mind. If the instrument was designed for parents of school-aged children, we felt the terminology should be clear to us as well. However, some instruments developed for use by students in communicative disorders courses at the college level had technical language that was not always clear to us; but in many cases we assumed it was appropriate for the intended audience. Nevertheless, we caution instrument users to check terminology carefully.

We seldom found problems with grammar (a typographical error here and there), but feel that it's an important criterion not to be overlooked.

—Criteria Addressing the Format

19. Clearly printed instrument

The format (organization, style and general appearance) of an instrument is a factor which should be considered during development because it can influence the response rate and the ease and accuracy with which the instrument is completed.

When reviewing instruments we labeled as "a problem" any instruments whose items are difficult to read or could be misinterpreted due to poor photocopying, mimeographing or illegible handwriting.

20. Adequate space for responses and comments

It is frustrating for a respondent who is interested in completing an instrument to discover that there is inadequate space for writing his or her responses. Certainly there will be cases in which a respondent will want to attach a sheet or write on the back of the page to continue comments. But those should be rare cases. For most respondents the space provided should be adequate for making whatever responses are required, whether they are simple checks on a scale or open-ended comments.

As we reviewed instruments we considered the ease with which respondents could write responses in spaces provided. We also reviewed the spacing from the point of view of the person aggregating the information, since a "problem" for the respondent usually means a "problem" for the person reading the responses later.

21. Conveniently located directions

Instruments that require detailed directions which may have to be referred to frequently as the respondent completes the instrument are more convenient to use if they appear on each page where they are needed.

Questions regarding the development and use of the Instrument Summary Critique Form should be directed to:

Ann Hallawell
Evaluation Center
Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, MI 49008
(616) 383-8166

Evaluation Training Consortium

Instrument Summary Critique

Instrument Name _____ Instrument Number _____ Date _____

Criteria Addressing the Introduction / Cover Letter	Problem	Not a Problem
1. Identification of the purpose and use of the instrument	_____	_____
2. Identifying why the respondent was selected	_____	_____
3. Assurance of confidentiality and anonymity of the respondent	_____	_____
4. Motivator(s) for completion and return of the instrument	_____	_____
5. Directions for returning the completed instrument	_____	_____
6. Identifying who is requesting the information	_____	_____

Comments:

Criteria Addressing the Directions:		
7. Directions for completing the instrument	_____	_____
8. Guidelines for comments	_____	_____

Comments:

Criteria Addressing the Items:		
9. Item stems relevant to purpose of the instrument	_____	_____
10. Unidimensional stems usage	_____	_____
11. Specified unit of response	_____	_____
12. Exhaustive response categories	_____	_____
13. Non-overlapping response categories	_____	_____
14. Response categories relevant to the stems	_____	_____
15. Other response options provided when necessary (I don't know, not applicable, no opinion, etc.)	_____	_____
16. Use of language which may bias responses	_____	_____
17. Use of clear terminology	_____	_____
18. Use of correct grammar	_____	_____

Comments:

Criteria Addressing the Format:		
19. Clearly printed instrument	_____	_____
20. Adequate space for responses and comments	_____	_____
21. Logically sequenced items	_____	_____
22. Conveniently located directions	_____	_____

Comments:

REFERENCES

Observational Recording of Others'/Own Behaviors

Flanders, N. A. *Analyzing Teacher Behavior*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1970.

Heyns, R. W. and R. Lippitt. "Systematic Observational Techniques." In G. Lindzey, ed., *Handbook of Social Psychology*. Cambridge, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1954. Vol I, pp. 370-404.

Medley, Donald M. and Harold Mitzel. "Measuring Classroom Behavior by Systematic Observation." In N. L. Gage, ed., *Handbook of Research on Teaching*." Skokie, IL: Rand McNally, 1963. Chapter 6, pp. 247-326.

Rosenshine, Barak and Norma Furst. "The Use of Direct Observation to Study Teaching." In R. Travers, ed., *Second Handbook of Research on Teaching*. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1973.

Simon, A. and E. G. Boyer, eds. *Mirrors for Behavior: An Anthology of Classroom Observation Instruments*. Vols. I, II, and III. Philadelphia: Research for Better Schools, 1970.

Weick, K. "Systematic Observational Methods." In G. Lindzey and E. Aronson, eds., *The Handbook of Social Psychology*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1968. Vol. II, Chapter 13, pp. 357-437.

Conducting Surveys

Babbie, Earl R. *Survey Research Methods*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Co., Inc.

Berdie, Douglas R. and John F. Anderson. *Questionnaires: Design and Use*. Metuchen, NJ: The Scarecrow Press, Inc., 1974.

Demaline, R. E. and D. W. Quinn. *Hints for Planning and Conducting a Survey and a Bibliography of Survey Methods*. Instructional Aid Series (number 2). Evaluation Center, Western Michigan University.

Kish, Leslie. *Survey Sampling*. New York, NY: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1965. 643 pages.

Oppenheim, A. N. *Questionnaire Design and Attitude Measurement*. New York: Basic Books, 1966.

Orlich, D. C. *Designing Sensible Surveys*. Pleasantville, NY: Regrave, 1978.

Payne, Stanley L. *The Art of Asking Questions*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1951. 249 pages.

Administering Objective Tests

American Psychological Association. *Standards for Educational and Psychological Tests and Manuals*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association, 1966.

Ebel, R. L. *Measuring Educational Achievement*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1965.

Gronlund, N. E. *Constructing Achievement Tests*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1965.

Martuza, Victor R. *Applying Norm-Referenced and Criterion-Referenced Measurement in Education*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1977. 352 pages.

Thorndike, R. L. and E. Hagen. *Measurement and Evaluation in Psychology and Education*. New York, NY: John Wiley and Sons, 1969.

Collecting Ratings on Others/Self

Fishbein, Martin, ed. *Readings in Attitude Theory and Measurement*. New York, NY: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1967. 499 pages.

Shaw, Marvin E. and Jack M. Wright. *Scales for the Measurement of Attitudes*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1967. 604 pages.

Analyzing Products, Existing Records; Producing Inventories

George, A. L. "Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches to Content Analysis." In I. de S. Pool, ed., *Trends in Content Analysis*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1959. pp. 7-32.

Holsti, Ole R. "Content Analysis." In G. Lindzey and E. Aronson, eds., *The Handbook of Social Psychology* (2nd ed.). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., Inc., 1968. Vol. II, Chapter 16, pp. 596-692.

Lofland, John. *Analyzing Social Settings: A Guide to Qualitative Observation and Analysis*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Co., Inc., 1971. 136 pp.

Webb, Euguen, Donald T. Campbell, Richard D. Schwartz, and Lee Sechrist. *Unobtrusive Measures: Nonreactive Research in the Social Sciences*. Chicago, IL: Rand McNally, 1972. 225 pages.

Interviewing

Cannell, Charles F. and Robert L. Kahn. "Interviewing." In G. Lindzey and E. Eronson, eds., *The Handbook of Social Psychology* (2nd ed.). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., Inc., 1968. Vol. II, pp. 526-595.

Intervierers Manual, Institute for Social Research. Ann Arbor, MI: Survey Research Center, 1976.

ETC INSTRUMENT CATALOG ORDERING FORM

Please send our project a copy of the following instruments:

Instrument Name and Number	Instrument Origin	Cost
1.		
2.		
3.		
4.		
5.		
6.		
7.		
8.		
	Postage & Handling	$1.50
	TOTAL	

Your Name: _____

Project Name: _____

Address: _____

All order forms should be addressed to:

ETC Instrument Catalog
Evaluation Center
Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, Michigan 49008

ETC INSTRUMENT CATALOG ORDERING FORM

Please send our project a copy of the following instruments:

Instrument Name and Number	Instrument Origin	Cost
1.		
2.		
3.		
4.		
5.		
6.		
7.		
8.		
	Postage & Handling	$1.50
	TOTAL	

Your Name: _____

Project Name: _____

Address: _____

All order forms should be addressed to:

ETC Instrument Catalog
Evaluation Center
Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, Michigan 49008

SPECIAL REQUEST

Please describe the type of information you wish to gather (be as specific as possible).

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

If we need more information to process your special request, where may we reach you?

Your Name: _____

Project Name: _____

Address: _____

Phone: _____

All order forms should be addressed to:

ETC Instrument Catalog
Evaluation Center
Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, Michigan 49008